Beginning of

Survey of the history of the Habiru problem

This title was preceded by

The contribution of Walter Scott Athearn to the philosophy of religious education

The background of organization and thought of the Evangelical Mission Covenant Church of America

Search by above titles on archive.org to continue reading this collection of Pacific School of Religion Theses from 1939 call number Thesis Cage 1939 v.3

Survey of the History of the ḤABIRU Problem

by

Kosaku Yonemura

B. Lit., University of Doshisha, Japan, 1936
M. A., Pacific School of Religion, 1938

Thesis

Submitted in the

Department of Old Testament Literature
and Semitic Languages

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Sacred Theology

in the

Pacific School of Religion

1939

A Survey of the History of the ŞABBĀTAY ŢEVIYE Problem

by

Kosaku Yonemura

B. Lit., University of Doshisha, Japan, 1936
M. A., Pacific School of Religion, 1938

..

Thesis

Submitted in the

Department of Old Testament Literature
and Semitic Languages

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Sacred Theology

in the

Pacific School of Religion

1939

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/surveyofhistoryo00unse

To

Mr. and Mrs. D. T. Uchida

who have made my stay in

Berkeley a happy one I sincerely

dedicate this little effort.

To

Mr. and Mrs. D. T. Uchida

who have made my stay in

Berkeley a happy one I sincerely

dedicate this little effort.

PREFACE

Through the efforts of the late Dr. William Frederic Badé whom I had the pleasure to meet on his visit to the University of Doshisha, I have had the pleasure of studying here at the Pacific School of Religion during the last three years. My interest in the fields of Old Testament studies has been further heightened by the inspiration of my Old Testament teacher and scholar, Dr. James Muilenburg. Through the medium of these words I would like to express how greatly indebted I am to him. Without his help and instruction this study on the problem of the Ḫabiru could never have been accomplished.

I wish to express my thanks to Dr. C. C. McCown, Director of the Palestine Institute, whose sharp and critical mind has greatly helped in the improvement of this effort.

Others to be mentioned are my friends, Miss Misaki Iijima and the Rev. and Mrs. Tadao Aiura. My thanks to Miss Iijima who did the translation of French articles, read the first draft for corrections, and aided me in the securing of books at the University of California Library. To the Rev. Aiura I am greatly indebted for his many valuable suggestions, and to his wife, Mrs. Aiura goes the credit for putting this manuscript into final form.

PREFACE

Through the efforts of the late Dr. William Frederic Bade whom I had the pleasure to meet on his visit to the University of Deabiabs, I have had the pleasure of studying here at the Pacific School of Religion during the last three years. My interest in the fields of Old Testament studies has been further heightened by the inspiration of my Old Testament teacher and scholar, Dr. James Muilenburg. Through the medium of these words I would like to express how greatly indebted I am to him. Without his help and instruction this study on the problem of the Habiru could never have been accomplished.

I wish to express my thanks to Dr. C. C. McCown, Director of the Palestine Institute, whose sharp and critical mind has greatly helped in the improvement of this effort.

Others to be mentioned are my friends, Miss Miasel Iljima and the Rev. and Mrs. Tadao Aiura. My thanks to Miss Iljima who did the translation of French articles, read the first draft for corrections, and aided me in the securing of books at the University of California Library. To the Rev. Aiura I am greatly indebted for his many valuable suggestions, and to his wife, Mrs. Aiura goes the credit for putting this manuscript into final form.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE ii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS iv

INTRODUCTION. v

Chapter

I. ḪABIRU AND SA•GAZ IN THE TELL EL-AMARNA LETTERS. 1

i Ḫabiru
ii SA•GAZ

II. ḪABIRU AND SA•GAZ IN BOGHAZ-KÖI AND BABYLONIAN INSCRIPTIONS. 9

i Interchangeable Uses of Ḫabiru and SA•GAZ
ii SA•GAZ, Sûtû, ḫbt and Kaššit
iii Their Relations to Ḫabiru

III. THE ḪABIRU IN THE NUZI TABLETS 26

IV. THE ḪABIRU (HEBREWS) IN EGYPTIAN INSCRIPTIONS 36

i "Shashu" in the Karnak Texts and Its Relation to the Ḫabiru
ii ʿEperu in Egyptian Inscriptions
iii ʿApiru in Stela of Seti I at Beth-shan

V. THE RELATION OF THE HABIRU AND THE HEBREWS (עברים). 45

i Eber, Ibrim in the Old Testament
ii Aramaean Origin of the Hebrew People
a. Abraham b. Relation to the Aramaean
iii Relations of the Ḫabiru with the Hurrians, Hyksos and the Hittites

VI. THE ḪABIRU (HEBREWS) IN PALESTINE. 80

i The First Migration and the Negebite Theory
ii The Second Migration
iii The Third Migration

CONCLUSION 105

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 108

V. . . . . .

VI. . . . . .

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AASOR	Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research (New Haven, 1920-)
AJSL	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures (Chicago, 1884-)
AJT	American Journal of Theology (Chicago, 1897-1920)
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research (South Hadley, Mass., 1919-)
CAH	Cambridge Ancient History (Cambridge, 1923-32)
ET	Expository Times (Edinburgh, 1889-)
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society (New Haven, 1842-)
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature (New Haven, 1881-)
JPOS	Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society (Jersalem, 1921-)
Kn	Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Tafeln (Leipzig, 1915)
OLZ	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung (Leipzig, 1898-)
QSt	The Palestine Exploration Fund: Quarterly Statement (London, 1869-)
RB	Revue Biblique (Paris, 1892-)
ZATW	Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentlich Wissenschraft (Giessen, 1881-)
ZDPV	Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palestina-vereins (Leipzig, 1878-)

INTRODUCTION

The period between Middle Bronze II and Late Bronze II (c. 2000-1200 B. C.) in Palestine is of great importance to the history of religion. At the beginning of this period (about 1800 B. C.), the inhabitants of Canaan first achieved a true culture: the fertility cultus. It is connected with the appearance of the people known to history as the Hyksos. The Hyksos were not a homogeneous people but a more or less fused conglomeration of Armenoid stocks from the Highland Zone and Semitic Mediterranean. Several factors entered into their achievement of political power. The controlling elements among them were natural fighting men, and the presence of the Ḫabiru people. A tremendous and rapid religious metamorphosis occurred in Palestine as a result of the advent of the Ḫabiru with the Hyksos.[1]

Since the discovery of the Tell el-Amarna Letters in Egypt (in the winter of 1887-1888), the Ḫabiru problem has become the great interest among the Old Testament scholars. In spite of their great effort, the problem is not yet solved, because it is, in some cases, very hard to find a common solution based upon archaeological discoveries, literary criticism, and the patriarchal narratives found in the Old Testament.

In this paper, I have tried to present a brief

---

[1]See Graham, W. C. and H. G. May, Culture and Conscience; An Archaeological Study of the New Religious Past in Ancient Palestine, Chicago, 1936, pp. 64-75.

survey of the findings of modern scholars towards the solution of the Ḫabiru problem. Outside the Bible, the Ḫabiru are mentioned in the inscriptions which have been found in Babylonia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Asia Minor, Palestine, and Egypt. To all of them, I have referred and presented in this thesis, but it is my great regret that I could not refer to the cuneiform tablets from Mari (Tell el-Harîrī) and Ališar (Anatolia) in detail, because of lack of material.

To the questions of the date and route of the Exodus, I have made no reference because they constitute another problem. The present thesis has been written with the purpose of showing how the evidence secured through archaeological research has thrown light on the solution of the Old Testament problems and how scholars are trying to solve the Ḫabiru problem in relation to the Israelite settlement in Canaan.

CHAPTER I

ḪABIRU AND SA·GAZ IN THE TELL EL-AMARNA LETTERS

i Ḫabiru

In the Tell el-Amarna Letters, the Ḫabiru are mentioned under this name in the letters of Abdi-Ḫiba only.[1] The general character of the Habiru in these letters may be found from the references, which are given in the following

---

[1]Burney transliterates this name ARAD-Ḫiba, on the basis that this name means 'servant of (the goddess) Ḫiba' which is probably Hittite-Mitannian. According to him, ARAD-Ḫiba is Hittite or Mitannian, not Semitic. If this is so, it follows that the Sumerian ideogram ARAD 'servant', probably stands for the Hittite or Mitannian word for 'servant' which is unknown to us. He says that the ordinarily accepted form Abdi-Ḫiba (reading the Hebrew or Canaanite עבד for the ideogram 𒀀𒈾) is based upon the assumption that Abdi-Hiba was a Semite, which is highly improbable (Burney, Israel's Settlement in Canaan, p. 66, n. 5; Judges, p. LXXXVI). A. Gustavs, (OLZ, 1911, pp. 541 ff) and Meek, (Hebrew Origins, p. 8) on the same ground, render it 'Put-i-ḫepa'. For the Mitannian root "put" is taken as meaning 'to serve' as it is interpreted by Bork (Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft, 1909, No. 1, p. 126) who regards it as meaning 'to enlist or levy troops' "ausheben, anwerben von (Soldaten)". (See Weber in Kn., pp. 133 f). But other Assyriologists propose the form Arta-Hepa (Dhorme, RB, 1909, pp. 62, 72; Hommel, Sitzungsberichte der K. böhm. Gesellschaft, 1898, p. 10). For the first element in Hittite proper names is frequently Arta, as in Arta-tama, Arta-manya, and similar compounds. Jack, (The Date of the Exodus, pp. 160-162) reconciles the name Abdi-Ḫiba with the appellative expression 'Adoni-Zedck, the king of Jerusalem' (Josh. 10: 1, 3). Most scholars like Böhl, (Kanaanäer u. Hebräer, 1911), Winckler and Albright (JPOS, II, 1922, p. 127) prefer to write the name Abdi-Ḫiba. They hold the view that Abdi (?)-Ḫeba is formed with the name of the Cappadocian goddess Ḫebe or Ḫeba (Ḫepa). Waisler regards Abdi-Ḫiba as an Amorite. (JPOS, X, p. 189). Against these views, Speiser argues that ARAD-Ḫepa himself is a Hurrian, because Ḫepa is a demonstrably Hurrian goddess (AASOR, XIII, 1933, p. 53).

table:[1]

No. of letter.		
286:	17-20	"because I said to my Lord, the king's officer, why are you favorable to (love) the Ḫabiru and unfavorable to the (native feudal) princes?"
	56	"The Ḫabiru have devasted all the king's territory" (amêlûtu Ḫa-bi-ru).
287:	30-31	"and that of Lapaja's sons who are delivering the king's land to the Ḫabiri."
288:	37-38	"the Ḫabiru are occupying the king's cities."
	44 (?)	"his servant have slain .... for the Ḫabiri (?)"
289:	22-24	"For if there are no troops, the land of the king will be lost to the Ḫabiri (ḫa-bi-ri-ki)".
290:	12-13	"The territory of the king is lost to the Ḫabiri".
	22-24	"For if there are no troops, the land of the king will be lost to the Ḫabiri".

According to Langdon (ET. XXXI, 1920, p. 324) and Jack (The Date of the Exodus, p. 120 n. 2), the term Ḫabiru, which is Babylonian, is a collective noun, not a gentilic expression. Ḫabiru is the nominative, but the word only

---

[1] These numbers refer to Knudtzon's "Die El-Amarna-Tafeln", Leipzig, 1915. These series of letters have been translated in the following books: Winckler, H., The Tell el-Amarna Letters, N. Y. and Berlin, 1896, pp. 302-315, Nos. 179-185; Keilinschriftischen Textbuch zum Alten Testament, Leipzig, 1903, pp. 1-12. Ungnad, A., in Gressmann's (Editor), Altorientalische Text u. Bilder zum Alten Testamente, Tübingen, 1909, pp. 132-134; Rogers R. W., Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament, London, 1912, pp. 268-278; Jack, J. W., The Date of the Exodus, Edinburgh, 1925, Appendix, III, (pp. 265-269).

occurs in this form in two places in the letters.[1] In the remaining six places, the form used is the genitive-accusative Ḫabiri. As Langdon mentions, in one instance the genitive form Ḫa-bi-ki-(Ki) is followed by the geographical determinative for 'political state', and hence the Ḫabiru are a people connected more or less vaguely with some province; the word is employed only in the singular, and is a diptote, that is, it is inflected in the genitive and accusative by the same inflectional ending "i".[2]

We learn from Abdi-Ḫiba of Jerusalem that the Ḫabiru were coming from the land of Še-e-ri (Seir) attacking districts and towns in the Negeb and southern Palestine where he ruled and that they were pushing into Gezer, Gath, and Lachish:

> Behold, the territory of Gazri (Gezer), that of Askalon and the city of Lachish have given them food, oil, and all the necessities.[3]

The passage does not state that it was the Ḫabiru to whom these three cities had given help, but the words are preceded by a gap of several lines, and it is evident that the Ḫabiru must have been mentioned in the missing part, as they are again in the section that follows.[4]

---

[1] Kn., No. 286: 56; No. 288: 38.

[2] See Winckler, The Tell el-Amarna-Letters, pp. 314-5, No. 185: 11; Kn., No. 290: 24.

[3] Kn., 287: 14-16; cf. Winckler, ibid., No. 180: 14-16

[4] Jack, ibid., p. 123, n. 1.

Abdi-Ḫiba was seeking to restrain the dangerous growth of the Ḫabiru, and therefore draws upon himself the hostility of all. As we see in his letters, they were also attacking Jerusalem, which apparently fell into their hands, for Abdi-Ḫiba's letters cease at this time.

Abdi-Ḫiba also complains that the Ḫabiru were in Beth-Sâni (Debir)[1] and that Schechem was likely to fall into their hands.[2]

ii SA•GAZ

There are in the Tell el-Amarna Letters many references to a people described ideographically as the SA•GAZ who were considered as invaders of the northern districts of Palestine. But the SA•GAZ and Ḫabiru seem to be described as the same invaders in the same district in Lapahi's letter and Abdi-Ḫiba letters. Lapahi was the governor of Gazri (Gezer) west of Jerusalem and he made frequent complaint about the SA•GAZ as did Abdi-Ḫiba about the Ḫabiru. We read:

> Let my Lord, the king, know that my youngest brother is in rebellion against me, and has occupied the city of Mu..-hazi, and has made an alliance with SA•GAZ (Ḫi), and they are now for this reason beginning hostilities with me.[3]

---

[1] Kn., No. 289.

[2] Some scholars, including Winckler (Kn., No. 185) find the difficulties of transliteration too great. If Schechem had thrown in its lot with the Habiru, this would be accounted for by the fact that it was connected with the history of Jacob. See, Jack, ibid., p. 123.

[3] Kn., No. 298.

and

> Look! SA·GAZ people are powerful against us and let my Lord, the king, extend his hand to me, and let my Lord, the king, rescue me from the hand of the SA·GAZ in order that SA·GAZ may not destroy us.[1]

So, the SA·GAZ people that Lapahi speaks of might be the people led by Lapaya who seems to be faithful to Pharaoh (Winckler, ibid., No. 186) until they were attacked by invaders.[2] These invaders have been considered to be the Habiru. The attacked then found it expedient to join their aggressors.[3] According to the letter of Biridija, the chief of Megiddo, the groups next attacked his city.[4] In this letter the SA·GAZ are mentioned as the aggressor along with Lapaya's men.[5] Again Abdi-Ḫiba of Jerusalem complains that the Milki-el is in league with the sons of Lapaya. We read:

> Behold, this deed is the deed of Milki-el and the deed of sons of Lapaya (Labaya), who have given up the land of the king to the Habiru.

As stated above, the sons of Lapaya were already allied with the SA·GAZ. Some scholars believe that these two groups, the SA.GAZ and Habiru, must be identical.

---

[1] Kn., No. 299: 18-24.

[2] Winckler, ibid., No. 162.

[3] Winckler, ibid., No. 165: 30 f. Kn., No. 254: 32 ff, "I (Lapaya) do not know whether Dummuia has gone with the SA·GAZ". Dummuia is supposed to be Lapaya's son. Jack, ibid., p. 188, n. 4.

[4] Kn., No. 264

[5] The sons of Labaya (Lapaya) are distinguished from the Habiru.

But this is not sufficient to prove the identity of the SA·GAZ and Ḫabiru. Because, in the letter of Abdi-Ḫiba (Kn., No. 287) and in the letter of Biridija, the Kashi seems to play the same rôle as the Ḫabiru.

Scheil, basing his view on this occurrence and on the Kassite (Kashi) names in the Larsa tablets,[1] believes that the Ḫabiru were in origin Kassite and that they served among the forces of the Elamite dynasty of Larsa. Many scholars, Halery,[2] Hilprecht,[3] Reisner[4] and Lagrange,[5] have a view that Kassites were the Ḫabiru.[6]

Weber has an another view that the Kassites were the Sudanese mercenaries and not Ḫabiru.[7] Sayce regards the Ḫabiru as the mercenaries who served the Hittite governors of the Canaanite cities as bodyguards and identifies them with the Kashi people mentioned in Abdi-Hiba's letters.[8]

---

[1] "(A gentilic, Ḫabira'a), Ḫarbishipak Ḫabira" in Rawlinson, Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, iv, (2), 34, Nos. 2, 5; "Kudurra, son of a Ḫabira" in Hilprecht, Old Babylonian Inscriptions, No. 149, Obr. 22; see also W. J. Hinke, A New Babylonian Stone, 190-195 (Philadelphia, 1907), quoted from Jack, ibid., pp. 136-137.

[2] Journal Asiatique, (1891, p. 547)

[3] Assyriaca, 1894, p. 33, n.

[4] JBL, 1897, pp. 143 ff.

[5] RB, 1899, pp. 127 ff.

[6] See Burney, Judges, p. LXXXI, n.

[7] Kn., pp. 1100 f.

[8] ET., XV, pp. 282 ff.

Jack opposes these views and makes a difference between the Kashi people and the Ḫabiru, saying that whoever the Kashi people were, whether Ethiopians, Babylonians, or the Hittites, they were certainly a different people from the Ḫabiru.[1] In Abdi-Ḫiba's letter (Kn., No. 287), the two peoples are distinguished from each other, for if they were identical, why should Abdi-Ḫiba apply different names to them in successive sentences? Jack believes that the Kashi mentioned by Abdi-Ḫiba were the royal servants or troops who had made accusations against him to the Pharaoh.[2] They were either from the district of Kash in the land of the Hittites, as Sayce holds, or more probably were mercenary troops from Ethiopia in the service of the Egyptian High Commissioner. Thus, the Kashi are not identical with Ḫabiru.[3]

There is another argument to prove the identification of the SA·GAZ and Ḫabiru. While Abdi-Ḫiba refers exclusively to the encroachments of the Ḫabiru without mentioning the SA·GAZ, other princes in the south refer in a similar connection and similar terms to the encroachments of the SA·GAZ

---

[1] Ibid., p. 146.

[2] Op. cit., p. 146.

[3] Ibid., p. 139; Ethiopia occurs frequently in the hieroglyphics as Kash (Heb. כּוּשׁ) "That the name 'Kash' in the Amarna Letters refers to this southern Egyptian province is evident from the fact that Rib-Addi of Byblus frequently pleads with the Pharaoh to send his Kashi troops to restore Egyptian prestige in Phoenicia (Kn., No. 131, No. 133), and that in one of the passages where he mentions them (Kn., No. 133) the word Kashi occurs as a gloss on Meluḫa (i.e., Ethiopia)" Jack, ibid., pp. 139-140.

making no allusion to the Ḫabiru. The statement of Abdi-Ḫiba regarding the Ḫabiru, "Should there be no troops this year, all lands of the king, my Lord, will be lost"[1] is comparable with the statement by Baiawa as to the SA·GAZ, "Unless Yanḫamu comes this year, all the land will be lost to the SA·GAZ"[2]. But this proof is also very weak, because the language of these ancient scribes was very limited, so there is almost the same expression concerning the danger whether in the north or south.[3]

---

[1] Kn., No. 288.

[2] Kn., No. 215.

[3] Jack, ibid., p. 189.

CHAPTER II

ḪABIRU AND SA.GAZ IN BOGHAZ-KÖI AND BABYLONIAN INSCRIPTIONS

i Interchangeable Uses of Ḫabiru and SA.GAZ

The great discovery of Hittite tablets by Winckler at Boghaz-Köi in Asia Minor in 1906 further strengthens the argument that the Ḫabiru and the SA•GAZ are identical. In these tablets the expression "gods of the Ḫabiru" occurs as a variant for "gods of the SA•GAZ. Winckler[1] has given a preliminary account of the extraordinary treaties made by the kings of Ḫatti with Mitanni, Nuḫaššše, and Kizzuwadi. Jack gives the table showing the "Parallels of gods of SA•GAZ and that of Habiru in the Boghaz-Köi Treaties" as follows:[2]

i (ilâni SA•GAZ) Treaty between Shuppiluliu, king of the Hittites, and Mattiuâza, king of Mitanni. Date, c. 1356 B. C. also ilâni ŠA amêlûtu SA.GAZ.

ii (ilâni SA amêlûtu SA•GAZ) Treaty between Mattiuâza, and Shuppiluliu. Date, c. 1365 B. C.

iii (ilâni Ḫa-bi-ri) Treaty between Shuppiluliu and Tette, king of Nuḫašši. Date, c. 1375 B. C.

iv (ilâni Ḫa-bi-ri) Treaty between Shuppiluliu and Aziru, king of Amurru. Date, c. 1375 B. C.

v (ilâni Ha-bi-ri-e-es) Treaty between Shuppiluliu and the Ḫajasa Land. Date, c. 1375-1368 B. C.

vi (ilâni Ha-bi-ri) Treaty between Murshilish II (or III ?), king of the Hittites, and Tuppi-Teshup I, king of Amurru. Date, c. 1340 B. C.

---

[1] Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft, XXXV, 1907, p. 25, n.

[2] Ibid., Appendix, VI, p. 272 cf. Jirku, Die Wanderungen der Hebräer, Der Alte Orient, XXIV Heft, 1924, p.18.

vii (ilâni Ḫa-bi-ri-ia-aš) Treaty between Tuthalia II (or III ?), king of the Hittite, and Ulmi-Teshup, king of Amurru. Date, c. 1250 B. C.

The date covers about 1375-1250 B. C. In the oaths of these treaties a large number of Hittite, Mitanni, and related deities are invoked. The treaty between Shuppiluliu (Shubbiluliuma) and Tette, invokes a list of over fifty gods; and strangely enough, near the end occurs this passage:[1]

> The goddess Nindubdubna of Kadeš, the Lebanon Montains, Mont Šariiane, Mount Bîšaita, the gods of Lulaḫhi (an unkown people), the gods of Ḫabiri, the goddess Ereškigal.

On the other hand, the treaty between Šubbiluliuma (Shuppiluliu) and Mattiuâza of Mitanni has in an equally long list of gods the following passage:[2]

> The god Maniiawanniš of the city Landa, the gods of Lulahi, the gods SA·GAZ.[3]

A variant copy has gods of šiluḫḫi, gods of the SA·GAZ men. On these grounds Langdon,[4] Böhl,[5] and Jirku,[6] as well as Winckler[7] believe that this leaves no longer

---

[1] Quoted by Langdon, ET., 1920, p. 326; Figulla-Weidner, Boghaz-Köi, I, p. 21, 27-29.

[2] ET, 1920, p. 326.

[3] (ilāni SA·GAZ) Figulla-Weidner, ibid., p. 7, 50.

[4] Ibid., p. 326.

[5] Kanaanäer und Hebräer, pp. 87-88.

[6] Die Wanderungen der Hebräer, in Der Alte Orient, XXIV, 1924. Heft 2, p. 13.

any doubt about the identification of the SA·GAZ and Ḫabiru and claim that the Sumerian word SA·GAZ does mean the Ḫabiru and cannot be rendered in any other way here.

We have another proof that the SA·GAZ and Ḫabiru are interchangeably used. Meek shows us the occurrence of both terms in cuneiform tablets discovered in Asia Minor and Babylonia.[1] I quote Langdon's statement[2] concerning the texts of the Larsa dynasty: "In 1915 Père Scheil discovered on a small Larsa record of the military archives of Rim-Sin this important record: Dated (2155-2095).

> Four flounced cloaks for the sergeants of the amel Ḫa-bi-ri, received from Ibni-Adad the master workman. They are in the reckoning of the temple of Shamash. (Delivered by) the hand of Ili-ippalzam. Month of Nisan, 11th day, year when Rim-Sin became king.[3]

The habiri in this Sumerian record are obviously private soldiers, for they are under the supervision of the uku-uš, Semitic ridû, a military officer of low rank." In several of a large number of Larsa records of the Babylonian collection of Yale University,[4] amel SA·GAZ occurs. Langdon believes that it is obviously a variant of ḫabiru, and he gives again a résumé of each of the Sumerian records of

---

[1] Hebrew Origins, p. 8.

[2] ET., 1920, p. 328.

[3] Revue d' Assyriologie, XII, 1915, p. 115. The same group of Larsa texts at Yale University have the same ideogram copied by Grice, Letters from Ur and Larsa, No. 165.

[4] 253 of them have been published by Miss E. M. Grice in Records from Ur and Larsa, dated in the Larsa Dynasty. 1919.

Larsa which refer to the lù SA·GAZ or 'fighting man'.[1]

A. Grice, No. 33. Eighteen sheep levied for the lù SA·GAZ, from two shepherds. Seals of the overseers. 11th month, 21st day. Year when the great court of Shamash was built. Reign of Warad-Sin.

B. Grice, No. 47. Thirty-four sheep levid for the lù SA·GAZ, from a shepherd. Seals of the overseers. 10th month. Same year as A.

C. Grice, No. 50. Seventeen sheep lù SA·GAZ-ŠU, 'for the fighting men', bought by Ibaššiili. Taken in charge by Ibni-Ea. Seals of the overseers. Ninth month. Year when Kazallu was destroyed. Unknown date. Either Warad-Sin or one of his immediate predecessors.

D. Grice, No. 46. Sheep 'for the fighting (SA·GAZ) men', brought by Taribum. Taken in charge by Abu-ṭâbum. Seals of the overseers. Ninth month. Same year as C.

E. Grice, No. 51. Eighteen sheep, food 'for the fighting men (SA·GAZ), brought by Imgur-Sin. Seals of the witnesses. Seventh month. Same year as C.

F. Grice, No. 52. Thirty-five sheep, food 'for the fighting men (SA·GAZ), brought by Sinid-innam. Seals of the overseers. Ninth month. Same year as C.

G. Grice, No. 53. Fourteen sheep, food 'for the fighting men (SA·GAZ), brought by Abi-ṭâbum. Seals of the witnesses. Same month and year as C.

E. M. Grice says that as lù SA·GAZ is the ideogram used in the Amarna Letters for the Ḫabiru; perhaps SA·GAZ in these texts may have been the ideogram for the Ḫabiru and they may have been mercenary soldiers, according to the

---

[1]Langdon, op. cit., p. 328.

suggestion of Sheil.[1]

They also served in the armies of Hammurabi, as we know from the following letter published by the late Prof. L. W. King:[2]

> To Sin-idinnam say, thus writes Hammurabi: "when thou seest this tablet send to me Ili-tukulti the baker who is in the service Apil-Shamash, and who is now resident with Anu-pî-Sin the captain of amel SA·GAZ Pl".

Langdon gives a definite conclusion[3] for the identification of the Ḫabiru at Babylon and Larsa in the twenty-second to the twenty-first centuries, with the Ḫabiru in Syria, and Palestine six centuries later; they could have received the name SA.GAZ only from the Sumerians or Babylonians, most certainly the latter, because they had a legal status as a class of people in the service of the State. Langdon identifies the Habirites at Larsa with the SA·GAZ who were also Habirites in the service of the Hittites and Amorites of the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Burney, however, says that this discovery, while certainly proving a general equivalence of the Ḫabiru with the SA·GAZ, does not necessarily involve the conclusion that SA·GAZ in the Amarna correspondence was always and everywhere understood and pronounced as Ḫabiru. The con-

---

[1] Revue d' Assyriologie, XII, pp. 114, 115.

[2] The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi, London, 1898-1900, No. 35.

[3] Ibid., p. 328.

trary can be shown to be the case.[1]

If the SA•GAZ is identical with the Ḫabiru always and everywhere the Tell el-Amarna Letters show that the Ḫabiru were making an equally successful attack even in the northern part of the country. Rib-Adda, the king of Gebal, declared the SA•GAZ (Ḫabiru) were at Beirut and were in the employ of the Amorite army;[2] Zimrida, the king of Sidon,[3] Itakama of Kinza,[4] and Abdi-Ḫiba of Jerusalem makes the same complaint.

Jack considers the SA•GAZ as plundering nomads from the north Syrian desert and they might belong to any nationality, but in general they were connected with the Hebrew race. By the correspondence, the SA•GAZ attacks seem to be on Phoenicia and Syria, and appear to have commenced some what earlier than those of the Ḫabiru.[5]

Moreover, to prove that the Ḫabiru were in the southern part of Palestine, Jack shows a report of Mut-Baal, who is believed to be a son of Labaya, to Yanhamu, the High Commissioner, regarding affairs in the south. Though Mut-Baal does not mention the invaders by name,

---

[1] Israel's Settlement in Canaan, p. 70.

[2] Kn., No. 87, No. 71.

[3] Kn., No. 144.

[4] Kn., No. 189.

[5] Kn., p. 52. Jack, ibid., pp. 125; 183-184.

Jack believes, he refers to Ḫabiru.[1] By a careful reading of Mut-Baal's report, Jack states that cities lying to the south and south-west of Jerusalem were hostile or fallen, as in the following:

Udumu	(the Biblical Duma, 12 miles south-west of Hebron).
Aduri	(the Biblical Adoraim, 4 miles south-west of Hebron).
Araru	(the Biblical Aroer, 11 miles south-east of Beersheba).
Meshtu	(unidentified).
Magdalim	(the Biblical Migdal-God ? east of Ashkelon, or Tel Mejadil, 7 miles west of Udumu ?).
Ḫinyanabi	(the Biblical 'Anab, 14 miles south-west of Hebron).
Zarki	(13 miles south-east of Hebron).
Ḫawini	(the Biblical 'Anim, 12 miles south of Hebron).
Yabishiba	(unidentified).

If these identifications, some of which are given by Weber and are accepted by Dr. S. A. Cook and other scholars,[2] are correct, Jack emphasizes that we have here what seems to be a valuable report of the invasion of the Ḫabiru in the southern parts. As Mut-Baal seems to have been a son of Labaya, he must have been contemporary with Abdi-Ḫiba and consequently the report may be taken as referring

---

[1] Ibid., 126.

[2] Cook, Cambridge Ancient History, ii, p. 316

to the same events as those mentioned in the Jerusalem letters.[1] However, we cannot overlook the fact that Labaya's sons were in league with the Ḫabiru. (See p. 8, Kn., No. 287). It might have happened after all the cities of "Gori" had become hostile or had been captured.[2]

ii SA·GAZ, Sûtû, ḫbt and Kassit

From the philological standpoint, we can show the evidence that the syllabic equivalent of ideogram SA·GAZ was generally ḫab-ba-tum, 'robber', 'plunderer', 'warrior', 'fighting man', and not Ḫabiru, 'Hebrew'.[3] Burney says that no doubt the common Babylonian verb sagâsu, which means 'to destroy', 'slay', and the like, is a semiticization of the Sumerian ideogram; and the element GAZ has by itself the value dâku, 'to kill, fight, strike', maḫâsu, 'to smite, wound' (Heb. מחץ); possibly the root ḫabâtu, from which habbatum is derived, though it regularly means 'to plunder', may have originally been connected with the root ḥbṭ which runs through Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic with the sense 'to strike or beat', in which case the root-sense of

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 127.

[2] "Gori" represents the Ghôr (the plain of Jordan) or "Kharu", the Egyptian name for south Palestine. Jack, ibid., pp. 126-127.

[3] Burney, Israel's Settlement in Canaan, p. 70, n.3; (Judges, p. LXXVI, Jack, ibid., p. 187) "In a syllabary given in Rawlinson, Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, II, 26, 13, g-h, (amēlu) SA.GAZ is explained by ḫab-b(a-tum). In another tablet (cf. R. C. Thompson, The Report of Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon, I, No. 103, obv., 7) the ideogram is glossed by ḫab-ba-a-te.

ḫabbatum would be 'cut-throat' rather than 'thief'.[1]

Jirku regards SA·GAZ as 'mercenaries' of the king (condottieri)[2]. According to him, SA·GAZ is the equivalent of Accadian ḫabbatu, 'bandit', derived from habatu, 'to rob, plunder'. The derivatives ḫubutâti (plural of ḫubuttu) and ḫubutûtu mean, respectively, 'tax-free property' and 'condition of being tax free' (of property). Identifying the SA·GAZ and Ḫabiru, he calls them 'the invading gang of robbers' or 'paid soldiers'.[3]

According to Albright, it is difficult to decide the exact meaning of the Summerian expression SA·GAZ, since 'SA' means 'cord, tendon', while 'GAZ' is 'to kill'.[4] Ungnad thinks that SA·GAZ means property "slinger" (Schleuderer),[5] but this is apparently deduced from the ideogram, which hardly lends itself to such an interpretation, since 'GAZ' means 'strike, slay', not 'throw'. Albright suggests SA·GAZ means property "strangler" (slayer with a cord).[6] However, after the SA.GAZ have been found mentioned in Hittite translations of the inscriptions of Narâm-Šin of Akkad,

---

[1] Burney, ibid., pp. 70-71.

[2] "Die Söldner in den Dienst des König."

[3] Ibid., pp. 15 f., 21f. "Die einfallenden Räuberscharen".

[4] JBL, XLIII, 1924, p. 390, n. 66.

[5] Die ältesten Völkerwanderungen Vorderasiens, Breslau, 1923, p. 8, quoted from Albright, op. cit., p. 390.

[6] Op. cit., p. 391.

Albright suggests that SA·GAZ is a translation of the archaic Su-ti-um KI, or the like, and merely shows that SA·GAZ was the ordinary Hittite equivalent of "Semitc nomad" in general.[1] Then, the SA·GAZ is considered as a specific group of people, "roving bands" or "bands of Bedouin", since as usually no distinction was made between them, and SA·GAZ is used interchangeably with Ḫabiru.

Dhorme states that the SA·GAZ represent essentially the element hostile to the Egyptian Dominion in the countries of Amurru and of Canaan; they were constantly placed in opposition with the ḫazânu, who were the governors or prefects charged with governing these countries under the authority of rabisu, that is to say under the commissary installed by the Pharaoh. At all events, the SA·GAZ were synonymous with betraying the Egyptian cause.[2]

In a letter from Dagan-takala, where he says the Pharaoh to deliver him from the hand of the "(amêlûtu) SA-GA-AZ-MEŠ, the robber-people (amêlûtu ḫa-ba-ti),and the Šutû (amêlûtu Šu-ti-i)".[3] Dhorme determines three groups of people out of this plea, on the ground that determinative amêlûtu, "men" precedes each one; but it is generally believed

---

[1] JBL, XLIII,1924, p. 392.

[2] Dhorme, R. P. P., "Les Nouvelles Tablettes d' El-Amarna", RB, XXXIII, 1924, p. 13.

[3] Kn., No. 318 in Burney's Israel's Settlement in Canaan, p. 72.

by Assyriologists that we have here only two groups (the SA·GAZ and Sûtû). The second expression is only an explanatory gloss on the first.[1] So far as can be gathered from the Amarna Letters, there were only two distinct classes of enemies in the north, the SA·GAZ and the Sûtû, and there seems no reason for regarding the ḫabati as a distinct group by itself.[2]

Thus, both the SA·GAZ and the Sûtû were enemies invading Palestine from Syria. Both peoples are in the service of the chieftain Namuyawaza as mercenaries.[3] Rib-Addi of Gebal (Byblus) not only complains of the aggressions of the SA·GAZ, but of the Sûtû having killed his Šerdânu mercenaries.[4] Burney gives good material to prove that the Sûtû were a nomad tribe inhabiting the northern part of the Syrian desert to the west of the upper Euphrates, as the following:[5]

> A chronicle that the Kaššite king of Karduniaš, Kadašman-Ḫarbe I (c. end of the fifteenth century B.C.), effected the conquest of the marauding Sûtû from east to west, and destroyed their power, built fortresses in Amurru, etc.[6]

---

[1] RB, 1924, p. 14, cf. Jack, ibid., p. 185.

[2] "Namiawaza's letter (Kn., No. 195, I, 27), where he offers his SA·GAZ and Sûtû for the help of the Pharaon" Jack, ibid., p. 185, n. 5.

[3] Cf. Kn., No. 195.

[4] Kn., No. 122.

[5] Israel's Settlement in Canaan, p. 75.

[6] Cf. Winckler, Altorientalische Forschungen, I, 1893, p. 115.

Adad-Nirari I of Assyria (c. 1325 B.C.) states that his father Arik-dên-ili 'conquered the whole of the widespreading Kutû, the Aḫlamû, and Sûtû'.[1]

The Aḫlamû, Burney says, are known to have been an Aramaean nomadic or semi-nomadic people.[2]

The Hittite king, Ḫattušili II, makes 'the Aḫlamû-peril' his excuse for having ceased diplomatic relations with the king of Karduniaš.[3]

Tiglath-pileser I (c. 1100 B.C.) tells us that he defeated 'the Aramaean Aḫlamû' who inhabited the district in the neighbourhood of Carchemish.[4]

iii Their Relations to Ḫabiru

Moreover, even the Ras Shamra Tablets which were discovered in Syria (Ugarit, Ras Shamra) in 1929, according to Jack's view, the Sûtû and the SA.GAZ are mentioned several times.[5] The Sûtû appear as Šʿm ("Shaʿytes"), their country is called Šʿ,[6] and both the high priest and scribe in Ugarit belonged to the Sûtû race. The SA·GAZ are clearly mentioned in lines 13, 22 and 30, under the syllabic equivalent ḫbt (ḫab(b)atu), "warrior", "fighting man", "plunderer".[7]

---

[1] Burney, ibid., p. 75.

[2] Ibid., p. 75.

[3] Op. cit.,

[4] Op. cit.,

[5] The Ras Shamra Tablets, Edinburgh, 1935, p. 35.

[6] Probably identical with יָשִׁיב in Ezek. 23:23.

[7] Jack, op. cit., p. 3, n. 1; cf. ibid., p. 34 n. 2. We find the name Ḫbt in RS, 1929, No. 2, 13, 22, 30; No. 4 (Hurrian), 56, 60 (twice), 62; No. 35, 5; Syria, XII, p. 390; XV, 2, p. 153.

Jack has ingeniously proved that in the name ḫbt from the Ras Shamra the SA·GAZ are to be recognized.[1] From these and similar historical references, it is evident that the Sûtû were a nomadic tribe inhabiting the country south and east of Amurru and the SA·GAZ were the Aramaeans from the same region.

Jack has revised his former view since the discovery of the Ras Shamra tablets, and says in his book, The Ras Shamra Tablets, that these people (SA·GAZ), whose home was in the north Syrian Desert, east of Palestine, were Ḫabiru, as the documents from Boghaz-Köi inform us, i. e., they belonged mostly to the wide spread Hebrew race, which embraced not only the Israelites but many clans or bodies between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean. (p. 34).

Burney believes also that the SA·GAZ, though meaning ḫabbatum, "robbers", is not, as such used in the Amarna Letters, a mere class-term (i.e., applicable to any body of people, of whatever race, who might adopt a bandit-life), but is definitely employed of a tribe or tribes from a particular locality, and united by racial affinity. This is clear from the fact that the ideogram is followed in two of its occurrences by the affix KI, "country" or "place".[2]

Against this theory, on the other hand, Jack argues

---

[1] See, Dussaud, R., "Les Découvertes des Ras Shamra", Paris, 1937, p. 18, n. 2.

[2] Kn., No. 215: 15; No. 298: 27.

that SA·GAZ is a class-term, not a proper name, and that it is rather a descriptive title. The two occurrences by the affix KI denote some country or locality, no doubt the north Syrian desert; but this does not prevent the ideogram from being also a class term, having reference to certain characteristics.[1] To him, where the ideogram SA·GAZ occurs in the Amarna Letters, it was probably meant to be read and understood as habbatu, "warrior", "smiter", "plunder", a word which seems to be connected with the Hebrew and Arabic root ḥbṭ (חבט) "to strike or beat".[2]

In the preceding pages, reference has been made to some documents in which the SA.GAZ and the Ḫabiru were used interchangeably, and some relations between the two were observed. Next question is what are the Ḫabiru? As already mentioned, there are many scholars who believe that the Ḫabiru were Kassite. Sayce identifies the Kassit people with the Ḫabiru in the Abdi-Ḫiba letter, basing his theory that the Ḫabiru were Hittite condottieri upon the result of his attempted decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions. The Hittite region was called by the name "Kas", and the references in the Tell el-Amarna Letters to the land of Kassu refer to the land of the Hittites.[3] Lastly, Sayce

---

[1] Ibid., p. 186.

[2] Ibid., p. 186. In relation to "SA-GAZ-KI", we have occurrence of "Ha-bi-ri-Ki" in the letter of Abdi-Hiba. (Kn., No. 289: 24).

[3] ET., XV, 1903, pp. 282 f.

states that Ḫabiru (-ri) cannot be a proper name because it it not Ḫabirâ (a gentilic form).[1]

Against this statement, Burney argues that Ḫabiru is a proper name and also a tribal name, because we have Sûtû (-tî), and Aḫlamû (-mî) as tribal names and yet they are not Gentilics. Moreover, he says, the Gentilic Ḫabira occurs with the two Kassite names, and the occurrence once of (amêlûtu) Ḫa-bi-ri (KI) marks the name Habiru as racial (a tribe from a particular district).[2] For the same reason, Luckenbill's view that Ḫabiru is an Accadian appellative meaning "brigand", seems to be broken down.

Dhorme, however, takes the view that Ḫabiru is an appellative and not a gentilic at all. The meaning of Ḫabiru is simply "allied, confederate or associate", and the Ḫabiru were a group of Syrian hostile to Egyptians and were under Hittite protection.[3]

Then, we may assume with Burney that the connection between the Ḫabiru and the SA·GAZ was a racial one; though it does not necessarily follow that all the SA·GAZ were Ḫabiru. Burney concludes as Dhorme does in Revue Biblique,

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 282.

[2] Judges, p. lxxxiii, n.

[3] RB., XXXIII, 1924, p. 15, Dhorme also says, "The Babylonian or the Hittite scribes used the SA·GAZ ideograph to point out the Ḫabiru as their allies (or relation). In the Tell el-Amarna Tablets, the SA·GAZ is used sometimes Ḫabiru to designate the natives who fought against foreign domination".

1909, p. 69, that the Ḫabiru may have been but a single clan of a large body of people called SA·GAZ.[1]

Knudtzon says that, although the two peoples were in one sense identical, we cannot accept under any circumstances the idea that 'Ḫabiru' is the syllabic equivalent (denomination) of the SA·GAZ people.[2] To be sure, they are closely connected but not identical.

Weber takes the view that the Ḫabiru is a phonetic reading of SA·GAZ and that we must postulate their identity.[3]

Langdon considers the Ḫabiru as mercenary soldiers who were imported (into Babylon) in the time of Hammurabi, identifying the Ḫabiru with the SA·GAZ.[4] The very fact, he says, that the Habirites have a Sumerian title proves that they held a legal status as professional soldiers. A Kassite king of about 1450 B.C. writes to an Assyrian usurper(?)[5] and accuses him of intrigue with a Kassite Ḫarbišipak Ḫa-bir-āi, "Harbishipak the Habirite". Again the Babylonian king Marduk-aḫê-erba (c. 1030) has left a memorial deed by which he bestowed an estate upon one Kudurra, son of -uššuru the Ḫa-bir-āi.[6] Habirite mentioned in these in-

---

[1] Israel's Settlement in Canaan, pp. 73-74.

[2] Kn., p. 51.

[3] Kn., p. 1336.

[4] ET., 1920, p. 327, also CAH, I, p. 420.

[5] Winckler, Altorientalische Forschungen, I, pp. 389-396.

[6] Hinke, A New Boundary Stone, 190-195.

scriptions seems to indicate a mercenary soldier.

Jirku also emphasizes that the Habiru were nearly always mercenaries or mercenary bands and that the term Habiru, as Landsberger and Sayce have mentioned, means "condottiere, condottieri" and that the word is an appellative, like its synonym Khabbatu, "raider, bandit".[1] Albright, however, stresses their nomadic character and makes the Habiru a "Nomadic People" who are very similar to the Hebrews of the Old Testament.[2] And he concludes that the Habiru names mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions belong to several languages, so that there is no reason to believe that the designation was then peculiar to a single ethnic group.[3]

---

[1] Kleinasiatische Forschungen, I, 1929, pp. 321-334.

[2] JBL, XLVIII, 1924, p. 392.

[3] The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, 1935, pp. 206-207.

CHAPTER III

THE HABIRU IN THE NUZI TABLETS

Since the excavation of Nuzi in the Spring of the year 1925, new light was brought forth toward the solution of the Habiru problem.[1]

According to the phonology, as Chiera and Speiser point out, the language of the Nuzi has a non-Semitic substratum. One might say that the Nuzians spoke Accadian. Many of the technical terms employed in the tablets are obviously taken over from another, unrelated language. Lastly, the overwhelming majority of the proper names belongs to a people that, linguistically at least, could have nothing in common with the Semitic population of Mesopotamia.[2]

The tablets from the districts of Kirkuk have proved that the Hurrians were well established in the area east of the Tigris, and that the presence of Hurrite elements in

---

[1] The expedition was a joint undertaking of the Iraq Museum and the American School of Oriental Research in Baghdad. Dr. Chiera, the annual professor of the School for the year 1924-5, was in charge of the excavation at Yorghan Tepe. (AASOR, VI, 1926, p. 84). The site of Nuzi, more correctly for the nominative Nuzu (Meek, The Haverford Symposium on Archaeology and the Bible, edited by E. Grant, p. 176) is ten miles from Kirkuk, and politically the district was a part of the country of Arrapha in southeastern Assyria. See Albright, JAOS, XLV, pp. 209 ff.; the regular reports which have appeared in BASOR, Nos. 18-42, and AASOR, VI, pp. 75-92, (by Chiera and Speiser), AASOR, X, pp. 1-73, (by Speiser).

[2] "A New Factor in the History of the Ancient East", AASOR, 6, 1926, pp. 75-76.

Mesopotamia is dated as early as the third millenium.[1] Frequent references in the Boghaz-Köi and Ras Shamra Tablets indicate that the Hurrians flanked the Hittite Empire to the southeast, and the Hurrians in large numbers we know were settled in northern Mesopotamia, particularly in Nuzi and Arrapha, owing their allegiance, at least in the sixteenth century to the king of Mitanni.[2]

The Ras Shamra tablets show that this non-Semitic race, the Hurrians, must have been well represented in Ugarit as well as throughout most of Syria and Palestine, at the beginning of the fourteenth century B. C.[3]

The word Ḫabiru appears in these Nuzi documents many times and with slightly different spellings.[4] The tablets cover a period of more than a century and, apart

---

[1]See Contenau, Texts Cunéiformes du Museé du Louvre, IX, 1-46. Gadd, RA, XXIII, pp. 49-161. For general discussions, Contenau, Babyloniaca, IX, Nos. 2-4. Nuzi collection; Chiera, Publications of the Baghdad School, vv. I-III, Harvard Semitic Series V, Pfeiffer, HSS, IX. AASOR, XVI, (1936), Additional Tablets from the Louvre, Contenau, RA, XXVIII, 27-39. Philological studies of the texts, Kramer; AASOR, XI, pp. 63-119. Essays; Speiser, AASOR, X, pp. 1-73, JAOS, LII, pp. 350-367, LIII, pp. 24-46.

[2]Cf. Meek, ibid., p. 3, "The people of Mitanni was for the most part Hurrites." AASOR, VI, p. 76.

[3]Their name occurs in the Ras Shamra tablets as Hry, a word which corresponds exactly to the Biblical חרי (Egyptian Ḫr), and Accadian Ḫurri. Jack, The Ras Shamra Tablets, p. 33.

[4]The word Ḫabiru, under the form ḫa-bi-ra, ḫa-bi-i-ra, became a personal name which is found about twenty-five times. Chiera, "Ḫabiru and Hebrews". AJSL, XLIX, (1932), p. 123.

from internal evidence, can be approximately dated from a letter of Shaušš̌atar, king of the Mitanni.[1] Concerning the date of the tablets, Speiser introduces the result of the studies of scholars in the article, "A Letter of Saushshatar and the Date of the Kirkuk Tablets", (JAOS, XLIX, 1929, pp. 269 ff.), as the following:

> Chiera and Speiser suggested the end of the first half of the second millennium.[2]
>
> Gadd, favored 1400 as the probable date of the inscriptions.[3]
>
> Contenau postulates a date identical to that which Gadd has suggested independently.[4]
>
> Albright would place somewhat later; about 1300 B. C.[5]
>
> Koschaker assigns (the Kirkuk documents) to the fourteenth century, although he reserves the last decades of the fifteenth as a possibility.[6]

Chiera himself places them in the fifteenth century B. C. This new material which we deal with, dates a little earlier than the Amarna period, but it is certainly near

---

[1] AJSL, XLIX, (1932), p. 115.

[2] AASOR, VI, p. 83 f.

[3] "Tablets from Kirkuk" RA, XXIII, p. 55, (Revue d' Assyriologie).

[4] "La glyptique syro-hittite", pp. 158ff: "Les tablettes de Kerkouk et origines de la civilisation Assyrienne", Babyloniaca, IX, pp. 36 ff.

[5] Journal of the Society of Oriental Research, XI, p. 235.

[6] Neue Keilschriftliche Rechtsurkunden aus der El-Amarna-Zeit, (1928), p. 19.

enough to be considered as practically contemporaneous.[1]

The occurrences of the word Ḫabiru, according to Chiera's study,[2] are as follows:

Singular Masculine.
amêl ḫa-bi-ru, JENu,[3] 188; 955; amêl ḫa-bi-rum, JENu, 686; amêl ḫa-bi-ru-ú, JENUu, 265; 358; amêl ḫa-bi-ru ...? JENu, 409; 540.

Singular Feminine.
ḫa-bi-ru-ú, JENu, 270; SAL ḫa-bi-ru-ú, JENu, 428; SAL ḫa-bi-ri, JENu, 180; SAL KI-MIN (ḫa-bi-ru), JENu, 188.

Plural Masculine.
amêlûti (-pl) ḫa-bi-ru-ú, JENu, 270; 688; amêlûti (-pl) ḫa-bi-ri-du, SMN,[4] 3208; amêlûti (-pl) ḫa-bi-ru, SMN, 3199; amêlûti ḫa-bi-ru, JENu, 955; amêlûti ḫa-bi-rum, JENu, 234.

Plural Feminine.
SAL (-pl) ḫa-bi-ru-ú, JENu, 1023; SAL (-pl) ḫa-bi-ra-du, JENu, 688.

Uncertain.
ḫa-bi-ru, SMN, 3191.

It may be worth while to note, Chiera says, that the word ḫa-bi-rum was very probably pronounced ḫabiru, since the final m was very frequently dropped; the striking point, however, is that we find here for the first time the feminine form of the word.[5] That we find frequently men with

---

[1] AJSL, XLIX, 1932. pp. 115-116, "Saushshatar is the first known king of Mitanni and his date is to be placed soon after 1500 B.C. Saushshatar must have been a contemporary of Thotmes III, whose reign began in 1501 B. C."

[2] AJSL, XLIX, 1932, p. 116.

[3] Joint Expedition with the Iraq Museum at Nuzi. Unpublished tablets.

[4] Catalogue of the Semitic Museum, Harvard University.

[5] Ibid., p. 116-117.

characteristically Semitic names,[1] proves that the Ḫabiru were foreigners. One of them, Arad-ku-bi is called a ḫabiru from the land of Aššur. Wa-aš-qa-bi-ia also belongs to Aššur and at-ti-ila-mu is called amêl aš-šu-ra-a-a-ú.[2] Some Habiru are described as coming from Ashur, selling themselves into slavery to one of the magnates of Nuzi. We see the Habiru figure in the "Slavery Contacts" from "Selected KIRKUK Documents" by Chiera and Speiser:[3] No. 7 (JENu, 409), Translation (JAOS, XLVII, 1927, p. 44).

> Zilikupi, a Ḫabiru, by his own word and wish, as a slave the house of Tehiptilla, the son of Puhishenni, entered.

No. 8 (JENu, 428) Translation.

> Sin-palti, a Habiru woman, entered of her own will the house of Tehiptilla as a slave. Now should Sin-palti withdraw and go into another house, Tehiptilla shall pluck out the eyes of Sin-palti and sell her for a price.

JENu, 394:[4]

> If they back out and say to Tehip-tilla, 'We are not slaves; we are not maidservants', then Tehip-tilla shall pluck out their eyes and give them for a price.

In JENu, 871, a woman is threatened with the same punishment if she says, "I am not a maidservant, and my child-

---

[1] Chiera shows a table of the names of the Ḫabiru in the Nuzi tablets. See Op. cit.,p. 117.

[2] Op. cit., p. 117.

[3] JAOS, XLVII, 1927, pp. 36-60. (Specially pp. 44-46).

[4] AJSL, XLIX, 1932, p. 119.

ren are not slaves". One of the Nuzi texts says,[1] "Tulprunnaya daughter of (Sheltunnaya) with Amar-sha-ili the Ḫabiru (....) in a lawsuit before the judges appeared, because Amar-sha-ili as slave to Tulpunnaya had come, but withdrew. And he appeared before the judges and the tongue of Amar-sha-ili before the judges declared: 'As the slave of Tulpunnaya I have entered.....'". We must notice that the social status of the ḫabiri in the city of Nuzi is that of slaves or servants, through self-enslavement, and that the appellation Ḫabiru is accompanied by purely Semitic names. For example: SMN, 3199[2],

> Four donkey-loads of barley (have been given) to Emuka for the Ḫabiru.

In the same tablet other amounts are given for food, for horse-feed, or for flour-making. The only information we can obtain from this is that a good number of Ḫabiru must have been gathered in one place, since the amount of barley given is rather large.[3]

JENu, 1023.[4]

> Ištar-aḫat and Aḫatia, these two Ḫabiru women from the land of Akkad, with their own consent into slavery (a-mu-ti) into the house of Teḫip-tilla were made to enter. And Dur-ilišu is the owner (?) of the women.

---

[1] "One Hundred New Selected NUZI texts", AASOR, XVI, 1936. No. 40:2.

[2] AJSL, XLIX, 1932, p. 118.

[3] Chiera, AJSL, XLIX, 1932, p. 118.

[4] Op. cit., p. 119.

> Should the women have a claim against them, Dur-ilišu shall clear them and give them (again) to Tehip-tilla. And Tehip-tilla forty shekels of silver for his right to succession has given. If Dur-ilišu backs out and wants (them) for himself, then he will have to pay to Tehip-tilla ten minas of gold.

It is clear from this contract that the owner of the Habiru had the right to sell them, but this special clause does not occur in any other Habiru contract.[1]

JENu, 188.[2]

> One a man, a Habiru, (called) Nurbiia .... in the hands of Dubbia is given ..... One man, ditto, Šukri-tešup commandeered and took to the land of Arrapha. Three men, ditto, Šurki-tilla took to the palace.

If correctly interpreted, Chiera says, the document shows that most of the Habiru were given a certain amount of choice in that they could generally decide whether to become the slaves of private individuals or to be assigned to the palace or to the government; but private service must have been better than that under the palace or the government because in the former instance the Habiru enjoyed a certain amount of freedom.[3] In all of these cases, while the Habiru appear to have a certain amount of freedom, still their owner lost nothing by this concession.[4]

Chiera refers to the cuneiform tablets which have

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 120.

[2] Op. cit., pp. 120-121.

[3] Ibid., p. 121.

[4] JENu, 386.

been found by the Oriental Institute expedition in Ališar (Anatolia). In a letter it is said, concerning the Ḫabiru, that if the princess wants to let them go, then they should be sent to the writer. If she does not want to let them go, then the man who receives the letter should free those men.[1]

Thus, Chiera concludes that we find in Asia Minor approximately the same condition as we discovered in Nuzi.[2] Chiera's conclusion is this: the Ḫabiru are "war prisoners" who are distributed to the state, the palace, or to leading citizens as part of the war booty. The fact that women and children are also included, and that special professions, such as that of the scribe, are mentioned, proves that the Ḫabiru cannot belong to any special trade or guild, such as mercenary soldiers or smiths, as has been suggested; nor can the identification of Ḫabiru with "nomads" be substantiated in view of the foregoing and also of the different nationalities which their names indicate.

It is obvious that war prisoners are not derived from among the people of one's own land. These "foreign enemies" settled in the land, and the word Ḫabiru became a personal name. A man would be called "the son of a foreigner", just as today one is called "the son of a soldier". However, Chiera remarks, the word habiru cannot be translated simply

---

[1] AJSL, XLIX, 1932, p. 122 cf. Gelb, Inscriptions from Alishar and Vicinity, (1935) No. 5, Obr. 9.

[2] Op. cit., 122. This statement seems to be too audacious.

"foreigner", for to the idea of "foreigner" must also be added that of "enemy".

It is noteworthy as Chiera emphasizes, that they were called ḫabiru by the surrounding people, instead of the special tribal name which they must have used among themselves.[1] "Who could these men be?" Chiera has the view[2] that the word Ḫabiru in these tablets gives no clue whatsoever as to the race or language of the people who invaded Palestine. They would have been called Ḫabiri regardless of race or color. But, does the study of the Ḫabiru in the Nuzi tablets (Mesopotamia) give no light to the solution of the Ḫabiru-IBRIM-Hebrew problems?

Wherever they are encountered, the Ḫabiru are evidently foreigners. In the west they are not Hittites or Canaanites, in the east they cannot be classed with the citizens of Arrapha or of Babylon. They are men without a country, either as expatriates or because no country had ever claimed them as citizens. As we have seen, they are strangers and, as such, nomads in a certain sense.

Speiser believes that a Ḫabiru was at first not necessarily one who belonged to a given ethnic group or who hailed from a specified locality, but rather one who was committed to a certain particular mode of living; it would naturally appeal more to nomads than to dwellers in towns

---

[1] AJSL, XLIX, 1932, pp. 123-124.

[2] Op. cit., p. 124.

and villages.[1] But, he says, the Ḫabiru cannot be equated simply with the Bedouin; they constituted broader social groups, with followers from the various countries through which they had passed. Then, the name Ḫabiru come to denote both nomads and foreigners of a certain type. "Nomad" is not an ethnic designation; it is an appellative, but so was also ḫbiru at the start.[2]

---

[1] AASOR, XIII, 1933, p. 37.

[2] Op. cit., p. 37.

CHAPTER IV

THE ḪABIRU (HEBREWS) IN EGYPTIAN INSCRIPTIONS

i "Shashu" in the Karnak Texts and Its Relation to the Ḫabiru

As a result of the Ḫabiru invasion and internal disorders in Egypt, Canaan threw off Egyptian rule during the period from the death of Amenhotep IV (1358 B.C.)[1] to the accession of Seti I of the Nineteenth Dynasty (1313 B. C.). The condition of Canaan at the beginning of Seti's reign is thus described in one of his inscription which was found in Karnak in Egypt:

> The vanquished Shasu (Š'- sw), they plan rebellion. Their tribal chiefs are gathered together, rising against the Asiatic of Kharu (H'-rw). They have taken to quarreling and cursing, each of them slaying his neighbor, and they disregard the laws of the palace.[2]

Another relief in Karnak, depicts the action in which the king ŚS scattering the Shasu and says:

> The Good God, Sun of Egypt, Moon of all lands, Montu in the foreign countries; irresistible, mighty-hearted like Baal, there is none that approaches him on the day of drawing up the battle-line. He has extended the boundaries of Egypt as far as the heavens on every side. The rebels, they know not how they shall (flee); the vanquished of the Shasu, who were --, -- -- his majesty; (becoming like) that which exists not. (Breasted, Ancient Records, III, p. 46, No. 86).

In this description it is possible to recognize the same state of affairs that is depicted in the Amarna

---

[1]Date refers to "Chronological Table of King" in Breasted, A History of Egypt, Scribners, 1912.

[2]Breasted, Ancient Records, III, p. 52. No. 107.

letters.

"Who is the Shasu?" is the next question. According to Albright, Egyptian word Shasu (š3 ʿsw) has the meaning "robber","nomad Arab" and corresponds to Hebrew šôsêh, "robber".[1] Then he believes that "those people of Pehel" in the Seti Stela, which was found in 1925 in the upper level of the southern temple of Rameses II at Beth-shan in Palestine, seem to correspond to the Bedouin (š3-s3) of these Karnak texts.[2] This Seti Stela in Beth-shan contains a very important account of military campaign in which the Pharaoh suppressed an incipient revolt in the Beth-shan area. On the lower part of the stela are twenty-two lines of text which state that on the tenth day of the third month of summer in the first year of his reign, a messenger came to inform Seti that the "wretched" chief who was in the city of Hamath -- a Hittite (?) -- had collected together many people, attacked Beth-shan, and allied himself with the "people of Pella (Pahel).[3] Albright has identified Pella (Pahel) with

---

[1] AASOR, VI, 1926, p. 42, n. 88. The name Hyksos is the Egyptian Hiku-khasat (pronounced in later times something like 'Hiku-shos), 'Princes of the desert'. Manetho explains the name as 'Prince of the Shepherds' by confusion with Shosu, 'bedouins'. See Jack, ibid., p. 169.

[2] AASOR, VI, (1926), pp. 41-42. The Karnak text -- The record on a wall of the temple of Karnak in Egypt by Sheshonk I, the Shiskak of I Kings 14:25, of his campaign in Palestine, confirms the statement of Kings. (Barton, Archaeology and the Bible, p. 28, cf. p. 456, f.)

[3] Rowe, ibid., p. 26.

the Pihilim (written Bi-khi-lim) of the Amarna Letter.[1] He tries to identify the Shasu with the Habiru of the Amarna Letter, basing his view on the historical situation, and the philological-etymological basis that Habiru is written with ideogram SA·GAZ = habbatu, "robber".[2] Meek, also has the same view.[3]

Is it impossible to suppose that a certain nomadic people who were invading Palestine who were under Egyptian rule at that time, were called "Shasu" in Egyptian inscriptions found in Egypt?

We might suppose again that this nomadic people, invaders, called Shasu "robber" might have had some relations with the people called the ʿApuru or ʿEperu described in the Egyptian inscriptions found in Palestine. In some records of the Egyptian Empire between 1500 and 1500 B. C., a people labouring in Egypt were called the ʿEperu.

ii ʿEperu in Egyptian Inscriptions

Prof. John A. Wilson has given an elaborate discussion on the study of the "ʿEperu of the Egyptian Inscriptions" (AJSL, XLIX, 1932, pp. 275-280), and has thrown light on the relation of the Habiru (or Hebrew) with the ʿEperu. He gives the cases where the term ʿEperu occurs in the

---

[1] Rowe, ibid., p. 26 n. 51.

[2] AASOR, VI, p. 42, n. 88.

[3] "A proposed Reconstruction of Early Hebrew History", AJT, XXIV, (1920) p. 214.

Egyptian texts; three of these texts mention the ʿEperu before 1225 B. C., but two of the texts place them in Egypt after 1170 B. C. as in the following:[1]

1. Leyden Papyrus I, 348, recto 6:6.[2]
   Leemans, Monumens égyptiens à Leide, Vol. II, pl.148.

Issue gain to the men of the army and (to) the ʿEperi who are drawing stone for the great pylon of the [house ?] of Ramses II.

2. Leyden Papyrus I, 349, recto 15.
   Leemans, op. cit., pl. 156.
   Practically the same sentence occurs.

Issue gain to the men of the army and (to) the ʿEperu who are drawing stone (?)

For some building of the god Re near Memphis.

These two Leyden papyri are from Memphis and are dated to the reign of Ramses II. In both cases it is clear that soldiers and ʿEperu are dragging big blocks of stone for construction work on building of the pharaoh or on a temple.

3. Inscription, in the Wadi Hammamât in Upper Egypt, lists the workers who have been sent by Ramses IV to the quarries there. Couyat and Montet; Inscriptions hieroglyphiques du Ouâdi Hammâmât, No. 12, I. 17, pl. 4.

Some are skilled workers; quarrymen, masons, army officers, paymasters, etc., a total of 500 individuals out of the 8,300 on the expedition. There are also "5000 men of the army; ..... 800 ʿEperu of the foreign troops of ʿAn --; and 2000 men of the temples of Pharaoh.

There are the unskilled laborers who do the heavy work of moving the stone blocks; the soldiers again,

---

[1] See ibid., p. 276-278.

[2] The hieratic papyri in the museum at Leyden.

ordinary temple laborers, and the ʿEperu.

4. The Great Papyrus Harris, where we find listed the property of the temple of Re in Heliopolis:

Soldiers, sons of (foreign) princes, Mariannu, ʿEperu, and the settlers who are in this place -- 2095 individuals.

Birch, Facsimile of an Egyptian Hieratic Papyrus of the Reign of Rameses, III, pl. 31, l. 8.

5. Story of "The Capture of Joppa" by a general of Thutmose III, as found in the Papyrus Harris 500.

The scene of the story is the city of Joppa in Palestine; the action is laid in the fifteenth century B. C., but the language is New Egyptian and the handwriting dates to about 1300 B. C., so that the use of our word need not be older than that date:

'Have the Ma[riannu] bring in [the horses and give] them fodder, or let an ʿEper pass by ... them'. And they guarded the horses and gave them fodder and .....

Pap. Harris 500, verso 1:5 -- last publication by Gardiner, Late Egyptian Stories, p. 82.

Again we have an ʿEper mentioned in connection with Mariannu, some Asiatic warriors. The text is very badly preserved, but we might infer that this Eper was a stableman or groom.[1]

As observed, in three cases the ʿEperu appear as unskilled workers in the quarries, once as temple property, and the last probably as a stableman. None of the accompanying names, Wilson states,[2] is gentilic; all refer to a condition: "soldiers", "settlers", etc. Wilson concludes that the ʿEperu do not belong to a tribe and the word would seem to be

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 277-278.

[2] Ibid., p. 278.

applicable to foreigners in the Egyptian service, in the status of slaves or serfs. This conclusion is strikingly paralleled by Chiera's conclusion of the Ḫabiru in the Nuzi tablets; that is, the term Ḫabiru in the Nuzi documents carries the idea of "foreign enemies" or "war prisoners who were divided among the state, the palace, and the leading citizens as part of the war booty". This designation would fit the ʿEperu in Egypt beautifully, and they would then be foreigners captured in war and brought to Egypt to labour for the temples, for the state in the quarries, or for an Egyptian campaign general.[1] These parallels do not mean that the Ḫabiru are identical with ʿEperu at this point in this discussion. A more satisfactory conclusion will be found in the following pages.

iii ʿApiru in Stela of Seti I at Beth-Shan

Before the discovery of a fragmentary hieroglyphic stela of Seti I at Beth-Shan in 1925, there have been many discussions about the relation of ʿApiru and Hebrew.

In 1862 Chabas first suggested that ʿApiru (ʿ-py-rw) was the phonetic equivalent of ʿIbri, Hebrew.[2] H. J. Heyes protects against Ed. Meyer's opposition.[3] B. D. Eedermans asserts that they (ʿApiru) are certainly Hebrews.[4]

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 278.

[2] Mélanges Égyptologique, 1862, pp. 42-54, "Les Hébreux en Égypte" in Böhl, ibid., p. 73.

[3] Bibel und Ägypten, 1904, pp. 152 ff.

[4] Alttestamentliche Studien, II, 1908, pp. 52 ff.

But he distinguishes them from Israelites, though he thinks many of them might have united with the Israelites in the Exodus. Böhl concludes in his book, "Kanaanäer und Hebräer, 1911" that the equation of ʿEperu (ʿApiru) and Hebrews is philologically uncertain and chronologically impossible. Because he could not refer to ʿApiru in Stela of Seti I at Beth-Shan, and he only referred to ʿApiru (ʿEperu) in Egypt dated from the reign of Ramses IV, when the Exodus already had taken place.[1] Max Müller explains the name of ʿApiru as that of a coast-dwelling people nomad Afri, who were Carthaginian Phoenicians and gave their name to Africa.[2]

One year before the discovery of Stela of Seti I at Beth-Shan, Jiruku argued that phonetically the equation of ʿpr and ʿEber is difficult, since the Egyptians of the New Empire regularly transcribe Semitic b (ב) by their own b. When Canaanite harb (Heb. ḥereb חֶרֶב "sword") is transcribed ḥarp, later hŏrp, it only shows that there was the same tendency for a final vowelless sonant stop following a consonant to become voiceless as one finds in the modern Arabic dialect of Egypt.[3]

Since the discovery of the ʿApiru on the Stela of Seti I at Beth-Shan in 1925, it has been proved that ʿApiru were Hebrews and they were in Palestine already at the time

---

[1] Ibid., p. 76.

[2] Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft, 1913, p. 255.

[3] Jirku, Die Wanderungen der Hebräer, 1924, pp. 10 ff.

of Seti I (1313-1292 B.C.) before Ramses IV (1167-1161 B.C.)[1] We read:

> On this day, behold, ((one, i.e., a messenger) came to inform) his majesty, may he live, be prosperous, be healthy! (that) these ʿApiru of the Mountain of the Jordan (?) (Yrdn?) and Tyr .... (had) [done so and so -- probably invaded Canaan]. Rowe, ibid., p. 29.

Jack believes that the name ʿApiru is the Egyptian form of "Hebrew", corresponding to the Babylonian Ḫabiru and the Hebrew ʿIbhri.[2]

Albright is inclined to prefer his own identification of the Apiru with Midianite tribe עפר , which also settled in southern Judah (I Chr. 4:17), especially since the ʿpr personal names so far known are all Semitic. He says that the ʿ-py-rw are naturally the ʿ-pw-irꜣ of the Egyptian texts of the New Empire, where they appear both as slaves and mercenaries, especially the latter; and that ʿEfer (עפר) would be Sûtû (Bedouin), both frequently mentioned in the Amarna Letters.[3]

Rowe suggests that if the ʿApiru are really the Hebrews or at least a branch of this race, in the undated Seti Stela, we have a reference to the Hebrews trying to conquer Beth-Shan from the Gilead range on the east side of the river.[4]

---

[1] See Rowe, The Topography and History of Beth-Shan, 1930, p. 29.

[2] Ibid., p. 239

[3] "Jordan Valley in the Bronze Age" in AASOR, VI, 1926, p. 37, n. 73.

[4] Ibid., pp. 29-30.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

R. Kittel, also, identifies the ʿAperu with the Ḫabiru: "They are not the Israelites, but the Israelites belong to them".[1]

Wilson suggests that the most straightforward equation is ʿpr = עפר , with a localization to Ophrah or Ephron or a similar place; but the Egyptian or Hebrew ʿayin (ע) may be represented in cuneiform by a ḫ, so that we have a perfectly possible equation of ʿEperu (ʿApiru) and Ḫabiru.[2]

Finally, Speiser definitely identifies the ʿApiru with the Ḫabiru. He explains that there are many cases in which a foreign b with r or l either before or after it is represented by b and not by p in the Egyptian writings, the fact that in the word ʿpr the p is followed by r surely makes it easier to regard it as representing an original ʿbr, and that no case is known in which the Egyptians wrote a foreign ḥ or ḫ by ʿ , so that of the two words (or forms) ʿbr (Hebrew) and Ḫabiru it can have been only the former that was reproduced as ʿpr. However, we see in the following pages, the names for the Ḫabiru and the Hebrews go back to the same source. He concludes that there is no objection to the assumption that the Biblical word for the Hebrews corresponds phonetically with Ḫabiru and ʿApiru.[3]

---

[1] Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 1932, I. pp. 304-305.

[2] Ibid., p. 279.

[3] AASOR, XIII, 1933, pp. 38-40.

CHAPTER V

THE ḪABIRU AND THE HEBREWS (עבר֥ים)

i Eber, Ibrim (עבר : עברים) in the Old Testament

We now come to the two questions regarding the relation of the Habiru and the Hebrews.

First: What is the relation of the Ḫabiru with the Hebrews in the Old Testament?

Second: What is the relation of the Ḫabiru mentioned in the Tel el-Amarna Letters and the contemporary Hebrews?

As an answer to the first question, the following scholars, except Dhorme and Landsberger,[1] recognize the philological equivalence of the Ḫabiru with the Hebrew (amêlûtû Ḫabiru with עִבְרִ֥ים), since the Canaanite ʿAyin (ע), the gutteral with which the word ʿIbri commences, is elsewhere in the texts represented by the cuneiform Ḫ (kh): Conder,[2] Hommel,[3] Zimmern,[4] Winckler,[5] Ed. Meyer,[6] Jensen,[7] Knudtzon,[8] Böhl,[9] Jirku,[10] Langdon,[11] Burney,[12] Jack,[13]

---

[1] RB, 1924 pp. 12-16, "Their denial bases on historical, not philological"; Albright criticizes it in JBL, p. 391.

[2] QSt, 1890, p. 327.

[3] Die altisraelitische Überlieferung, 1897, pp. 233 ff.

[4] ZDPV, XIII, 1890, p. 137.

[5] KAT, p. 196 f.

[6] Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme, 1906, p. 225.

[7] Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1909, p. 532.

[8] Kn.

[9] Kanaanäer und Hebräer, 1911, p. 85.

[10] Die Wanderungen der Hebräer, p. 6, pp. 13-14.

Kittel,[1] J.M.P. Smith,[2] Luckenbill,[3] Albright,[4] G. A. Barton,[5] and Speiser.

Speiser regards Burney's statement, that the philological equivalence of Ḫa-bi-ru with עִבְרִי is perfect, as too optimistic.[6] It applies only to the phonetic equivalence of the stems involved. Morphologically, Ḫabiru and עִבְרִי can be equated only on the assumption that the latter goes back to an earlier form ʿabir (u). The root ʿbr is capable of yielding the meaning "passing from place to place", hence in a derivative sense "being a nomad". This is by no means inconsistent with what we have learned about Ḫabiru. These groups appear to have been forever on the move. In Nuzi, some of the Ḫabiru come from Akkad, others from Ashur and even from Izalla.[7] What worries the writers of the Amarna letters most

---

[11] ET, XXXI, 1920, pp. 324 f. He holds to the identity of the Ḫabiru of the 22nd century with those of the Amarna period, and their identity with the Hebrews of the Old Testament tradition, even if we deny the perfect philological evidence.

[12] Judges, p. LXXIV, pp. LXXX f.

[13] The Date of The Exodus, p. 100, pp. 130 f.

[1] Geschichte des Volkes Israel, I, 1932, p. 293.

[2] AJSL, XXXV, (1919), pp. 230-231.

[3] AJT, XXII, 1918, pp. 35.

[4] JBL, XLIII, pp. 390-391.

[5] Archaeology and the Bible, pp. 446 f.

[6] AASOR, XIII, 1933, p. 40 n. 96.

[7] Op. cit., p. 41.

tion," and Spelman.

Hence Lucretius "human" existence, thus the philosophical equivalence of Epicurean with "pig" is perfect, as Lucretius[6] is opposed only to the domestic enjoyments of the sense involved. Metaphorically, Epicurus and Lucretius may be equated only on the assumption that the latter does have in earlier form Arabit (1). The root idea is expressed of obviously the meaning "passing from place to place", hence in a derivative sense "being a nomad". This is by no means incompatible with what we have learned about Epicurus. There seems to have been forever a flux here. In that, some of the spirit came from Ahead, others from Lamb and even Darwin.[7] What warrants the writers of the Aeneid Lucretius want

---

[6] Wright, F. A., Trans. Lucretius "Lucretius", p. 1, New York, 1930.

[7] Cf. Epicurus, Ep. Herod. 37 f.

[8] Cf. The Epic of The Pacific, p. 1++, pp. 120 f.

is precisely this cruising habit of the Ḫabiru. As we have seen above they were nomads not in the same sense as the Bedouin.

The likeness of the identical characteristics of both groups and philological, phonetical, equivalence prove the possibility of identification.[1]

ii Aramaean Origin of the Hebrew People.

The etiological explanation of the origin of the name Hebrew is that they were called after ʿEber (עֵבֶר), their ancestor in the Old Testament, for they are spoken of as "the children of ʿEber" (Gen. X, 21, בְּנֵי עֵבֶר)[2].

Albright explains that Heb. ʿEber, for ʿIbr, stands by epenthesis for ʿAbir, an intransitive participle of type fāʿil, from the stem ʿbr, "traverse, cross, wander", and thus means "wanderer, nomad"; the name is thus equivalent in significance to 'Arab'[3]. Since the oldest known form of the name ʿArab appears as ʿAribi, i. e., ʿArib, in the Assyrian texts, Albright continues, we are hardly going too far if we consider ʿAbir and ʿArib as actually transposed doublets. In this case, the former was the term in use during the third and second millennium B. C., with the sense of "Aramaean

---

[1] JENu, 1023, etc.

[2] Gen. 10:21, 24, 25; 11:14, 17; I Chron. 1:18, 19, 25.

[3] "Haupt has pointed out that the stems ʿbr and ʿrb are practically transposed doublets, since their derived berbal and nominal forms transpose their consonants frequently"; op. cit., pp. 389-390.

Bedawi" (the parent Hebrew stock is termed arammi ôbéd, "wandering Aramaean", in Deut. 26:5), while the latter was designation applied to Arab Bedawin from the beginning of the first millennium B. C., after the former had become rescricted to the Israelites and related Palestinian tribes alone.[1]

Another theory is that the name Hebrew has come from the name of a region, ʿEbir-nâri (ʿIbr-naharân in Minaean, and ʿEber-hannāhar in the Bible). According to Eduard Glaser's conclusion,[2] summarized by Fritz Hommel, Eber ha-nahar, in the Old Testament, is nowhere used of Mesopotamia, but always of the western bank of Euphrates; the Canaanites named the inhabitants of the land of Eber (the whole of the western bank of the Lower and Middle Euphrates), Ibri (or Hebrew), because they came from this region, and he says that the land of Eber is personified as one of the forefathers of Abraham. Against this theory, Hommel concludes basing on a comparison of Minaean inscriptions with cuneiform documents that Ebir nâri was rather originally the reign between Borsippa and Ur, and at once the original home of Abraham.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 390.

[2] Mittheilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft, 1897.

[3] The Ancient Hebrew Tradition, 1897, p. 324.

This is very clearly indicated in Josh. XXIV. 2, where we read:

> Your fathers dwelt of old in Eber ha-nahar, even Terah, the father of Abraham and the father of Nahor, and they served other gods: And I took your father Abraham from Eber ha-nahar and led him throughout all the land of Canaan.[1]

The word ʿEber in this case is a Hebrew common noun, meaning 'on the other side', 'across' and ʿEbir-nari signifies 'across the river', or the land accross the river.

E. G. H. Kraeling gains for ʿEber (Hebrew) the sense "one from the shore of the Euphrates" if we interpret ʿEber in Num. 24:24 as "shore-region" (of the Euphrates) basing his interpretation on the fact that a similar meaning is directly offered by Isaiah 7:20, where the "shores of the river" Euphrates are referred to as " ʿEbrei hannāhār, עברי הנהר ".[2]

At all events, whatever be the derivation of the word or the original name of the people, it is clear that long before 2000 B. C., before Abraham was born there were large colonies of the Hebrews in Babylonia as we have proved already by the Babylonian texts, and as we have seen that the occurrences of the name Habiru in Babylonian and Hittite document.

---

[1] "In later times, the phrase "mat e-bir nâri", or "Land beyond River" was used to point to Syria and the western provinces along the Mediterranean coast; in Assyria from at least the reign of Ashurbanipal (668-626 B.C.), in Babylonia from the reign of Cyrus (538 B.C.)." See Langdon, 'Babylon and "The Land Beyond the River"'.

[2] Aram and Israel or the Aramaeans in Syria and Mesopotamia, N. Y. Columbia University Press, 1918, pp. 31-32.

Rabbi Herbert Parzen discusses the name Ibri (Hebrew) basing his arguments almost entirely on biblical and post-biblical sources. Biblical exegetes, both traditional and modern, have unanimously assumed that "Ibrim" (עברים) is derived from עבר , referring either to Eber (Gen. 11: 14-17), or to the phrase עבר הנהר , generally translated "beyond the river" as we have seen on the previous pages. Against these traditional interpretations, Parzen argues that even though this etymology cannot be gainsaid; it does not definitively solve the problems connected with the use of this expression, because it does not define specifically the historic application of the name "Hebrew" to a single branch of Abraham's descendants, because it does not explain its use in the particular biblical verses and its frequency, and because it does not provide a definition that is uniformly applicable to all the citations.[1] He points out that in the Targum, the traditional Aramaic translation of the Bible, the term Ibri is translated in three ways:

1. Every reference in Genesis (14:13; 39:14; 39:17; 40:15; 41:12; 43:32) is rendered literally= עב'אה (Hebrew)
2. In the remainder of the texts, (see p. 255 n. 9, examp. Ex 1:15, 16, 19; 2:6, 7, 11, 13; 3:18 etc...)= יהודאי (Jew)
3. Exceptions, (see p. 255 n. 10, Ex 21:2; Dt. 15:12; Jer. 34:9, 14) בר ישראל (Israelite).

---

[1] AJSL, XLIX, 1932, pp. 254-261.

[2] Op. cit., p. 254.

[2]Op. cit., p. 944.

[3]Lyons, Chas., Idem, pp. 118-119.

The Vulgate, the Latin translation of the Bible, uniformly renders the word Ibri by "Hebraeus" (Hebrew). Hence it is of no significance in this study.

The Septuagint contains several interesting variants from the Masoretic text. The variations are clearly mistranslations due to misreading of the original text. The translator misread the Hebrew letter "ר"(r) for a "ד" (d), thus reading עבדים (slave) instead of עברים (Hebrews). In Gen. 14: 13, the phrase אברם העברי (Abram the Hebrew) is given as "Abram the easterner, the wanderer, the alien" (περάτῃ). This deviation is most interesting and vital.[1] Parzan thinks that the author by this translation desired to convey to his readers the exact, the literal, and probably the original meaning of Ibri (Hebrew)[2]. In the Mekhilta, comment on the phrase עבד עברי (Exod. 21:2) is "It must have reference to a slave who is a Jew ....".[3] After giving the critical survey of the use of the term "Hebrew", he concludes that the term Ibri (Hebrew) was at first a derogatory designation applied by the more civilized nations to the unsettled peoples around them, denoting an alien, barbarian, or Beduin, and that the Bible purposely uses this term when it describes a slavish state of subjection. This name was used to designate the roving and

---

[1] Parzan, ibid., p. 255-256.

[2] Op. cit., p. 256.

[3] Op. cit., p. 256.

[1]Hamann, Ibid., p. [illegible].

[illegible], p. [illegible].

[illegible], p. [illegible].

unsettled folk of the desert. It was a mock-name that ridiculed its bearers.[1] He believes that such a mock name in the course of time lost its stigma without protest and without consciousness of its original connotation. He believes that Joseph was a descendant of the Ḫabiru group of tribes,[2] and that as the etymology of cuneiform Ḫabiri is the same as Biblical Ibrim the Ḫabii comprised the entire nomadic folk between Palestine and the Euphrates. Parzen advances a very interesting suggestion that they were the scourge of the settled and civilized communities; they were feared and despised -- feared because of their cruel depredations, despised because of their vulgar barbarism; therefore, they were necessarily known in Palestine and in Egypt. Hence it was unnecessary for the writers of the Tel-el-Amarna letters to describe the invaders in detail.[3] He does not try to identify the Ḫabiru of the Amarna letters with the Biblical Hebrews, but he assumes that both groups came from the same region and from the same social source.

a. Abraham

Ungnad of Jena found Babylonian forms of the name Abram (אברם) written (A-ba-ra-ma, A-ba-am-ra-am, A-ba-am-ra-ma)[4] but, in 1917, Lutz found the fuller form,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 258.

[2] Ibid., p. 260.

[3] Ibid., p. 260.

[4] Ungnad, A., Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler, VII, 92:6, 13; 198: 12, 18.

namely, A-ba-ra-ḫa-am on a letter No. 15 in the Yale Babylonian Collection, which was written in the era of the patriarch.[1] Lutz maintains that אברם and the newly found A-ba-ra-ḫa-ma stand for one and the same name; they are all foreign renderings of a West Semitic name אברהם.[2] Lutz continues that the seemingly Hebrew אברם is really not Hebrew in form, but is rather to be explained as a Babylonian form of אברהם ; i. e., the West Semitic רהם has passed into the Babylonian râmu. He argues that A-ba-ra-ḫa-am is the Babylonian equivalent of the Hebrew אברהם , as in not a few cases West Semitic ה is represented in the cuneiform writing by ḫ . Lutz thinks that a reasonable theory of the origin of אברהם is that after the name had been reintroduced in the West in its Babylonian form, the writing of it was then subjected to the usual variation seen in foreign names, and in consequence it was rendered in more than one way, including the orthography with הה .

Was Abraham a historical person? Jirku believes definitely that Abraham in Genesis 14, is a man of "Flesh and Blood", but not the gentle and mild religious martyr whom later age has described.[3] He concedes that in Genesis

---

[1]Lutz, H. F., Early Babylonian Letters from Larsa, Yale University Press, 1917, (YBT, II) p. 5.

[2]Op. cit., p. 6.

[3]".....ein Mann von Fleisch und Blut, und nicht ein sonster, auldender Glaubensheld, wie ihn eine spätere Zeit geschildert hat;" Jirku, Die Wanderungen der Hebräer, p. 30.

many clans were personified as persons. But he says that as the names Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph had been found in Babylonian and Egyptian sources, they must be regarded as historical individuals. He especially emphasizes the historical character of Genesis 14, accepting the identification of Amraphel as Hammurabi.

Albrecht Alt basing his argument upon another theory proves his historicity. He gathered instances which indicate that to refer to a god as the god of such and such a man was a Semitic custom. He inferred accordingly that all such instances must involve historical persons. Because Yahweh is called God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and Jacob; these must be historical persons.[1] Böhl also maintains the essential historicity of the Patriarch.[2]

Abraham seems to have been a historical person, but, as G. A. Barton suspects, Abraham mentioned in Babylonian documents may not be the Biblical patriarch. The Babylonian Abraham, according to Barton's investigation, was a small farmer, who obtained a tract of land from a larger land-owner. He also hired an ox wherewith to work his land, and the hire of the ox as a good citizen should.[3] The

---

[1]Alt. A., Der Gott der Väter, Stuttgart, 1929, pp. 32-48, 72-73.

[2]"Das Zeitalter Abrahams", Der Alte Orient, 1931, B. 29, Heft I.

[3]Barton, G. A., Archaeology and the Bible, 1937, pp. 344-345. (1) Abraham Hired an Ox; translated from Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der königlichen Museen zu Berlin, VII, No. 92; (2) Abraham leased a Farm, op. cit., VII, No. 198; (3) Abraham Paid His Rent, op. cit., VII, No. 97.

patriach's father was Terah (Gen. 11: 26, 27) and his father Nohar; the father of this Babylonian Abraham was Awl-Ishtar, and his brother Iddatum. The Bible connects the patriarch with Ur and Haran; this Abraham living about halfway between these two cities.[1] A Terah appears as a moon-god in one of the myths of the Ras Shamra Tablets. In a recently discovered myth or legend, Barton states, Terah appears as a chieftain who fights the people of northern Palestine, including the tribes of Asher and Zebulun. At times he is a man; at times a god. Quoting Gaster's statement, Barton believes that later Hebrew tradition made Abraham the son of Terah and transferred to him the heroic characteristics which the older non-Israelitish story had attributed to Terah.[2]

At all events, Abraham was a historical person. But the next problem we face is his date. All scholars consider the events of Genesis 14 where Abraham is mentioned as to be historical.

Dhorme upholds the antiquated combination of Amraphel (Gen. 14: 1) with Hammurabi and of Arioch (Gen. 14:1) with Rim-Sin, by assuming that the source of Genesis 14 was in cuneiform, and supposing that some scribe wrote Ammurabi, which was then misread as Ammurapil and that the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 346.

[2] QSt., 1937, p. 204, quoted from The Haverford Symposium on Archaeology and the Bible, pp. 59-60.

name Rim-Sin was erroneously pronounced Rim-Aku, Riwaku, Eriwaku.[1]

This supposed identity of Hammurabi with Amraphel has been definitely disproved by Luckenbill's discovery of the true reading of the name Hammurabi in Amorite, ʿAmmu-ráwih,[2] later confirmed by Albright.[3]

Albright says that it is naturally quite impossible to compare עמרות with אמרפל , nor is it possible that the name has been taken from a cuneiform source, in view of the forms שנער and כדרלעמר , תדעל , which would be transcriptions from a cuneiform original. He concludes that the events of this chapter 14 have nothing to do with Hammurabi of Babylon, but must be dated considerably later; the episode must be dated in the unsettled age between the fall of the First Dynasty of Babylon (c. 1806 B. C.)[5] and the Egyptian conquest of Palestine and Syria in the sixteen century. He explains this view as follows; in Gen. 14:14, the retainers of Abraham

---

[1] RB., 1931, pp. 506 ff.

[2] JAOS, XXXVII, pp. 250-253.

[3] "The Amorite form of the name Hammurabi" , AJSL, XXXVIII, 1921, p. 140.

[4] "Shinar-Sangnar and its Monarch Amraphel", AJSL, XL, 1923, p. 127.

[5] "The accession of Hammurabi would have to be dated about 1870 B. C. and the First Dynasty of Babylon must have lasted from cir. 1970 to cir. 1670 B. C.". See, Albright, "A Revolution in the Chronology of Ancient Western Asia", in BASOR, No. 69, 1938, p. 19.

are called by the name ḥanikim (חֲנִיכִים). In a cuneiform letter found by Sellin at Taanach in Palestine, and dating from the fifteenth century or earlier, the same word appears in the form ḫanakû, pointing to a correct vocalization ḥanakim in Genesis.[1] His second illustration is the place-name Ham, mentioned in Gen. 14:5. He and Steuernagel identify Ham with a modern place of the same name in eastern Gilead.[2] This place dates as far back as the Bronze Age, and the name also accurs in the list of towns conquered by Pharaoh Tuthmosis III in Palestine, about 1480 B. C.

Böhl has identified Tid'al, king of the nations (Gen. 14:1) with a Hittite king Tud'alia or Tudḫalijas II, whom he dates c. 1650 B. C. Then, the date of Abraham is between about 1530 and 1480 B. C..[3] This identification has received support from Kittel, (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, I, p. 478), S. A. Cook (Cambridge Ancient History, I, 1923, p. 236) and Jirku (ZATW, XXXIV, 1915, pp. 152 f.).

Albright suggests the conclusion that the underlying account of the campaign waged by the Eastern kings (Gen. 14) appears to be historical; this account representing the invading host as marching down from the Ḥaurân

---

[1] Ibid., p. 141.

[2] BASOR, No. 35, p. 10.

[3] "Tud'alia I, Zeitgenosse Abrahams, um 1650 v. Chr.", ZATW, XLII, 1924, pp. 148-153, also "Das Zeitalter Abrahams" , Der Alte Orient, 1931 B. 29, pp. 8-19, Cf. Breasted; Ancient Records, III, No. 337, p. 154.

through eastern Gilead and Moab to the southeastern part of Palestine.[1]

Thus, there have been many discussions concerning the date of Abraham but no real evidence has been produced until last year. G. Ernest Wright judging from Glueck's explorations and Albright's work at Bâb ed-Drâ^{c} and Ader (southeast of the Dead Sea), puts the date of Abraham earlier than 'the first phase' of Middle Bronze (which began in Palestine about the twenty-first and twentieth centuries B. C.). His theory is based mainly upon the examination of Transjordan pottery, especially at Bâb ed-Drâ^{c}, Ader and other sites in the Dead Sea Valley. These sites are assumed to be the "cities of the plain" in Gen. 13, 14, 19, and in the Biblical narrative, Abraham is chronologically connected with these cities, especially with their destruction. These cities, according to Wright's archaeological research, were destroyed before the twentieth century.[2] He states:

> What caused the shift in pottery-making between EB II-III and EB IV-MBI, especially the sudden degradation, is unknown, but the archaeological situation is quite similar to that of the beginning of the Iron Age. It is not impossible that the shift is the result of an invasion of Amorite barbarians, with which Abraham may have been somehow connected.

According to his chronology in his book "The Pottery of

---

[1] Albright, ibid., p. 142.

[2] BASOR, No. 71, 1938, pp. 27-34.

Palestine from the Earliest Time to the End of the Early Bronze Age", New Haven, 1937, p. viii, EB, II (Early Bronze Age II) is "29th - 27th centuries"; EB, III is "27th - 24th centuries" and EB, IV is "23rd - 22nd centuries". Therefore, he may assume the date of Abraham to be before the Twenty Second Century B. C.. But it seems to me more probable to state that Abraham came to these cities after their destruction, because the Biblical narrative might have been written depending on the tradition of the "cities of the plain".

Further conclusions concerning the date of Abraham have been reached by Thureau Dangin and Charles F. Jean from the Mari tablets, which date from about 2050 B. C.. The Mari archives, found at the time of the third campaign of the Louvre at Mari on the Middle Euphrates under the direction of M. André Parrot (1935-1936), throw light on the complicated political situation that existed during the first thirty-three years of Hammurabi's reign, before his conquest of Mari. In these archives, Hammurabi of Babylon, Rim-Sin of Larsa, and Ibal-pî-el of Eshnunnak are mentioned. Then, according to the Mari Tablets the date of Hammurabi seems to be before the twentieth century, and if Hammurabi is a contemporary with Abraham, the date of Abraham might be about 2067-2024 B. C.).[1] But these early date theories are not

---

[1] BASOR, No. 67 (1937) "Western Asia in the Twentieth century B. C.: The Archives of Mari" by Albright. The archives of Zimri-Lim, the last king of Mari, con-

accepted by all scholars.

b. Relation to the Aramaean

Abram is the first person to be called a Hebrew in the Old Testament. (אַבְרָם הָעִבְרִי , Gen. 14: 13). The word 'ibri is used here, not as an ethnic term, but as an appellative, even as the Septuagint translates it, ὁ περάτης; and the meaning in both Greek and Hebrew, according to Meek, is "one who passes (from place to place), a transient, a nomad".[1] The word 'ibri is strictly a gentilic in Hebrew, but without the gentilic ending it is found in the name of the eponymous ancestors of the Hebrew race, 'ēber, which goes back to an earlier form 'abir(u).[2] And the exact equivalent of 'abir(u), and hence of 'ēber and 'ibrî, in cuneiform is ḫabiru (nom. sing.), ḫabiru (nom. pl.) and ḫabirî (gen. acc. pl.).[3] Therefore, Abraham might be the Ḫabiru, a term Ḫabiru as we have seen, employed by the Babylonians for nomads and slaves.

By the Old Testament narrative, we can see that Abraham has a close relation with the Aramaean. Rebeḳah, the wife of his son Isaac, is brought from Aram-naharaim, and is the daughter of Bethuel, the son of Naḥor, his

---

quered by Hammurabi about 2000 B. C.. See QSt. 1937, p. 10; Albright, American Journal of Archaeology, XLI, 1937, p. 152.

[1]Meek, Hebrew Origins, p. 7. Parzen, AJSL, XLIX, 1933, p. 258.

[2]Gen. 10: 24 f; 11: 14 ff; I Chron. 1: 18 f. See Meek, ibid., p. 7

[3]Meek, ibid., p. 7.

brother (Gen. 24 J.). Bethuel is termed 'the Aramaean' (Gen. 25: 20 P, 28: 5 P,), and so is his son Laban, the brother of Rebeḳah (Gen. 31: 20, 24 E,). Jacob himself spent many years in Aram-Naharaim (Gen. 29-31), and he married Laban's two daughters. (Laban is the Aramaean, Gen. 25: 20; 28: 5 in P; 31: 20-24 in JE). Jacob himself is called 'a vagabond Aramaean' (אֲרַמִּי אֹבֵד , Deut. 26: 5).

Luckenbill tries to show[1] that term אבד means "fugitive". On the Taylor Cylinder of Sennacherib (Col. V, 11), we read:

> The fugitive Aramaean, the runaway, the murderer, and the plunderer. Amel Ara (mu ḫ)alku munabtu.... ḫabbilu ṣiruššu ipḫuruma.[2]

In the documents from the Cassite Period, he says, ḫalku is frequently placed after the names of persons in the employ of the temple;and there is no doubt as to its meaning. The persons thus designated are fugitives. Munnabtu, a word of frequent occurrence in the cuneiform texts, comes from the root abâtu, the equivalent of the western אָבַד ; cf אֲרַמִּי אֹבֵד . It is another term for "fugitive", "runaway". Ḫabbilu, from ḫabalu, "to ruin", is closely related to ḫabaru, the root from which ḫabbiru is derived. Sennacherib, therefore, he believes, is describing Suzubu's

---

[1] "The Wandering Aramaen", AJSL, XXXVI, 1920, pp. 244 - 245.

[2] Op. cit., p. 244.

army as composed of the offscourings of society. He concludes that אֲרַמִּי אֹבֵד of Deut. 26: 5 is nothing more than a general term for "fugitive".[1]

Thus, we read:

> A nomad Aramaean (fugitive) was my father; he went down to Egypt to reside there, with a small company, and there he became a nation, great, mighty, and numerous; (Deut. 26: 5).

G. A. Barton supposes that the reference seems to be to Jacob, though possibly Abraham is intended; in either case, it shows that the Hebrews recognized that there was an Aramaean strain in their ancestry. Perhaps the Habiu were Aramaeans, or were allied with Aramaean.[2]

Albright shows[3] the striking analogy which exists between some of the names of the patriarchs mentioned in Gen. 11: 12-24 and geographical names of north-western Mesopotamia. For instance, Hebrew Naḥor (נָחוֹר) corresponds to Assyrian Til-Naḫîri, the name of a town in the Ḫarrân district. The vocalism of the two names is really exactly equivalent for Naḫiri should be written Naḫḫir(i); the two forms are practically interchangeable, on the principle of morphological adaptation, or analogical back-formation in Hebrew, since the Hebrews originally spoke

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 245.

[2] Barton, Archaeology and the Bible, pp. 154-155. Olmstead, A. T., History of Palestine and Syria, 1931, p. 196.

[3] "The Rôle of the Postdiluvian Patriarchs in Hebrew History" in "Contributions to Biblical Archaeology and Philology", JBL, XLIII, 1924, Ch. 4, pp. 385 ff.

Aramaic. The names of the last three patriarchs before Abram are also represented by place-names in Upper Mesopotamia.[1] We must also notice that in the Mari Tablets which were found on the Middle Euphrates three nomadic foes are mentioned; i. e., the Turukkû from east of the Tigris, the Numkhu from the Mesopotamian desert, and the Ḫabiru. But we can not tell whether the latter are actually the Hebrews of the Patriarchal age, or whether they are another group.[2]

iii Relations of the Habiru with the Hurrians, Hyksos and the Hittites.

As we have seen, the archaeological researches concerning the Hurrians have thrown a new light upon the Ḫabiru problem. They were a non-Semitic people who settled in north west Mesopotamia about the second millennium B. C. scattered all the way from Anatolia to Elam and from Armenia to Egypt. They interspersed with other ethnic elements or settled in colonies of their own.[3]

In Mesopotamia there is no trace of the Hurrians in the first half of the third millennium, and no Hurrian names occur in the inscriptions at Nuzi during the period of the Dynasty of Akkad (about 2700-2500 B. C.). But, it is during the second half of the third millennium that personal

---

[1] Op. cit., 387 f.

[2] BASOR, No. 67, 1937, p. 28.

[3] See Speiser, "Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B. C." , AASOR, XIII, 1933, pp. 13-54.

names first attest the presence of the Hurrians. The earliest known Hurrian name is that of Arishen, a king in the central Zagros country, before the twenty-fourth century. Hurrian names are found in Babylonian contracts of the Third Dynasty of Ur (Twenty third century) and become frequent in those of the First Dynasty of Babylon (about 2105-1806).[1] Thus, Cyrus H. Gordon,[2] Chiera,[3] and Speiser,[4] prove that the Hurrians were the most significant element in Upper Mesopotamia throughout the second half of the Second millennium B. C..

The occurrences of their name in the Ras Shamra Tablets as Ḫry(Ḫrį) show that the Hurrians formed a part of the population of Ugarit (in Syria) in the fifteenth century B. C.[5] Ginsberg and Maisler have proved that a considerable number of the proper names in the tablets are Hurrian, and that (along with Semitic), Hurrian was actually spoken in this district.[6] Jack states that four of the tablets are in this language, while others are a mixture of Hurrian and Semitic; and there are also

---

[1]The First Dynasty of Babylon is from cir. 1970 to cir. 1670., Albright, BASOR, No. 69, 1938, p. 19.

[2]"Evidence for the Horite Language from Nuzi", BASOR, No. 64, 1936, p. 23.

[3]AASOR, VI, pp. 75 f.

[4]AASOR, XIII, pp. 13 f.

[5]Speiser, ibid., p. 26.

[6]JPOS, XIV, 4, pp. 243 ff.

vocabularies of cuneiform ideograms with their syllabic equivalents in Hurrian.[1]

In Palestine, we have the evidence of Hurrian names in the tablets excavated at Taanach (Tell Ta'annek). A. Gustavs gives a number of Hurrian proper names as follows:[2]

A-gi-ia (Ta'annek Nr. 4 Vs. 12).

Ta-a-gu (Ta'annek Nr. 3 Rs. 5).

Puti (ARAD)-Ḫi-pa (Ta'annek Nr. 7 Rs. 7).

Gu-li-Tešup (IM) (Ta'annek Nr. 1, 3).

Ḫat-ti-til--- (Ta'annek Nr. 4 Rs. 4).

Puti (ARAD) -šar-ru-ma (Ta'annek Nr. 7 Vs. 3) etc.

In the Biblical passages, the Horites and the Hivites are mentioned together with the philological connection between Hurri and Hori. Until recently the name was linked with Hebrew hōr (חֹר, חוֹר) "hole, cave"; the Horites were, accordingly "cave-dwellers" and supposedly an obscure group of Edomite cave-dwellers in mountain districts.[3] But Speiser has proved the equation of Hurrians with Horites and he also has given good grounds for the belief that "Hivite" in the Old Testament is sometimes

---

[1] The Ras Shamra Tablets, p. 33.

[2] Gustavs, A., "Die Personennamen in den Tontafeln von Tell Ta'annek", ZDPV, L, 1927, 1 - 18, esp. pp. 7 ff, "Subaräische Personennamen".

[3] Speiser, ibid., pp. 26-27. Cf. Wright, "Troglodytes and Giants in Palestine", JBL, LVII, 1938, pp. 305-309.

a scribal error for "Horite" (חור for חרי), that the references to the Horites are even more frequent than our present text indicates.[1]

Indeed so largely were Hurrians settled in Palestine that the Egyptians, beginning with the Eighteenth Dynasty, regularly called the people of Palestine Ḫrw (ḫur) (Huru).[2] In Egypt, there were Hurrian settlers, but not in any great number, as the infrequency of Hurrian names suggests. Meek supposes[3] that they came to Egypt about 1750 B. C. with their fellow-wanderers, the Ḫabiru and the Hyksos. The term Hyksos is not ethnic, as Hurrian and Ḫabiru are, but merely descriptive. The Hyksos, therefore, do not represent a single ethnic group, because their personal names indicate different racial stocks, and the Hurrians were present in considerable numbers.[4]

Hooke gives a brief survey of the Hyksos and the Hurrians in Egypt based upon the theory of Speiser.[5] The term Hyksos was first used to mean 'desert princes'. Later on it came to be used in the general sense of 'foreign invader'. In view of what has been said above, he

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 30.

[2] Müller, Asien und Europa, 137, pp. 148 ff; Meek, Hebrew Origins, p. 4; Spiegelberg, OLZ, 1906, pp. 106 f.

[3] Op. cit., p. 5 and Speiser, ibid., p. 33.

[4] Jirku, JPOS, XII, pp. 51 f.

[5] "Archaeology and the Old Testament" in Record and Revelation, edited by H. W. Robinson, Oxford, 1938, p. 362.

concludes that the Ḫabiru also took part in this great movement of the Hyksos. Speiser points out that the two Egyptian words for 'chariot' are both loan-words, one clearly corresponding to the Semitic word for 'chariot', and the other suggesting the probability of a Hurrian derivation.[1] If the suggestion proves to be well founded, it is a further confirmation of the joint participation of the Hurrians and the Ḫabiru in the Hyksos invasion.

There is a great deal of similarity between the history of the Ḫabiru and the Hurrians. As we have seen we find the Ḫabiru in the Babylonian, Nuzi, Mari, Cappadocian and Boghaz-köi texts as mercenaries, "foreign enemies", "slaves", "a nomad band" (Beduin), or "wanderers" as the Hurrian were considered. The Hurrians and the Ḫabiru were thus coextensive to a remarkable degree. The Hurrians, Speiser points out, can always be recognized by their characteristic proper names; they were an ethnic unit. But the Ḫabiru cannot be identified in the same simple manner, because their names belong to a variety of languages; the people were obviously recruited from various ethnic groups.[3]

The first home of the Aramaeans who called themselves "Hebrews" and were called "Ḫabiru" by the other

---

[1]Speiser, op. cit., pp. 49-50.

[2]Op. cit., pp. 34-35.

[3]Cf. Burney, Judges, P. LXXXI; Chiera, AJSL, XLIX, pp. 115 ff.

people after leaving their homeland in Arabia, was in the valleys of the Euphrates and its tributaries, in the west and northwest of the greater Mesopotamia. Some of the objects discovered at Mari on the middle Euphrates are similar to those found at Asshur, Ras Shamra, and in Cyprus, indicating that Mari was on the great commercial route, which was frequented as much in the Second millennium B. C. as in the Third. It is interesting to note, considering that the migration of the Terahites is often dated in the time of Hammurabi, that the route folowed by the patriarchs Terah and Abraham of Ur, going towards Harran, probably passed by Mari.[1] It was from this region, called Paddan-Aram by the Hebrews, that Abram and the Benê Yacob came to Palestine and Egypt, probably swept into the current of the Hyksos irruption.[2]

We know that the Hebrews were in close contact with the Hurrians in more than one district. And it was inevitable that the Hebrews should have shared many cultural features with the Hurrians. The Kirkuk and Nuzi tablets contain indications of some very striking parallels between Hurrian and Biblical customs.[3] It seems to have been the

---

[1]Concerning the account of Abraham's Mesopotamian origin, from Ur and Harran, see Albright, Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, pp. 139 f; American Journal of Archaeology, 1935, pp. 145 f.

[2]Albright, JBL, XLIII, p. 393.

[3]See Gadd, C. J. and S. Smith, Revue d' Assyriologie, XIII, 1928, pp. 126 f; Smith, S., Journal of Theological Studies, XXXIII, 1931, pp. 33 ff.; Speiser, Mesopotamian

law that, if a married woman had no family, she was bound to provide another wife for her husband, and the offspring of this latter could not be expelled from the household. This is clear from a tablet dealing with the marriage contract between a man Shennima and his wife Gilimninu, and it goes to show, not only why Sarah gave her maidservant Hagar to Abraham, but that she had no legal right to demand Ishmael's expulsion, as she did (Gen. 21: 10), the Divine intervention being necessary before this could be done (Gen. 21:12).

Another interesting analogue from Nuzi is a legal arrangement as to the disposition of the birthright: one of the parties acquires the rights of the first born, while the other, whose claims to the privilege would have been actually justified by reason of birth, is satisfied to accept a minor share in his father's estate; the eldest son was entitled to a double share. The deal between Jacob and Esau involving the question of birthright was thus by no means unprecedented (Gen. 25: 27-34).

Moreover, the Nuzi documents make it clear that a son-in-law was considered the legitimate heir to the estate of his wife's father, if he was in possession of the latter's housegods. This fact puts Rachel's theft of her father's teraphim in an entirely new light (Gen. 31: 1 f.).

Meek concludes that these and similar analogue

Origins, pp. 162 ff., and AASOR, XIII, pp. 44 ff; JAOS, LII, 1932, pp. 365 ff., LIII, 1933, pp. 24 ff.; Gordon, BASOR, No. 66, pp. 25 ff.; Albright, Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, pp. 138 ff.; Jack, ET, XLVI, 1935, pp. 376 f.

between the Hebrews and the Hurrians, along with the occurrences of Hurrian names and references to the Hurrians in the Old Testament, indicate quite clearly that the two migrations went together. Hurrians and Ḫabiru were found together in Mesopotamia and it is likely that they would be found together in the west, the Hebrews manifestly were in a minor role as hangers-on and adventurers.[1]

Speiser notices that the Hurrians scattered throughout the Near East in the course of extensive ethnic movements, while the Ḫabiru were no doubt aided in their own pursuits by the upheaval that was responsible for these migrations.[2]

As we have seen, there is a possibility of the joint participation of Hurrians and Ḫabiru in the Hyksos invasion. The Hyksos, as we have seen, were composed of several distinct groups. They were not simply Semites or Hurrians, but definitely a conglomeration of Semites and Hurrians. But it is impossible to determine when and where this union was effected; it may have been in Syria or Palestine, or it may have grown on Egyptian soil. Speiser believes that the Semites and the Hurrians who formed the great majority of the Hyksos, were the first to conquer northern Egypt,[3] and he postulates that the Ḫabiru were the

---

[1] Meek, ibid., p. 15.

[2] Ibid., p. 46.

[3] Speiser, ibid., p. 51.

first to overrun the Delta, having been driven there by waves of Hurrians set in motion by the larger migration.[1]

How does this blend of fact and theory fit in with the patriarchal narrative? Speiser answers that Abraham's visit to Egypt does not have the characteristics of a movement on a large scale; it gives rather the impression of a peaceful entry. But several generations later the situation is markedly different. The House of Jacob, (the descent of Jacob) into Egypt seems to represent a southward movement of Aramaean Ḫabiru through Palestine with the Hurrians. These Ḫabiru participated in the Hyksos rule of Egypt; they must not be confused with the Ḫabiru of Amarna Letters, who threaten Palestine long after the expulsion of the Hyksos.[2]

Hooke points out that by the time of the Amarna Letters the expulsion of the Hyksos had left a number of Hurrians settled in Palestine, a fact which is substantiated both by the Egyptian name Ḫuru for the south of Palestine, a term which is clearly to be equated with the Hurrians, and by the good Hurrian name of the petty king of Jerusalem, Puti-Ḥepa (ARAD-Ḫepa or Abdi-Ḫiba).[3] ARAD-Ḫepa himself, Speiser believes, is a Hurrian; his ancestors arriving there with the other Hyksos.[4] The expulsion

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 52.

[2] Ibid., p. 52.

[3] Ibid., p. 363

[4] Many scholars believe that Abdi-Ḫiba is a Hittite, see above p. 1.

of the Hyksos did not entail their complete extermination, and it is not unnatural to find a Hurrian prince (king) in Jerusalem during the latter part of the Eighteenth Dynasty.

Hooke suggests that the disturbed conditions in Palestine resulting from the expulsion of the Hyksos may very well have led to such northward movements of Hebrew, or Ḫabiru, groups as are implied in the Hebrew tradition of the northward movement of the tribe of Dan, a movement which may also have caused the tribes of Asher and Zebulun to migrate from the Negeb.[1]

Speiser emphasizes the distinction between the Ḫabiru, or Hebrews, of the patriarchal period and those of the Amarna age. But both of them, though not to the same extent, were responsible for the Israelites.

Concerning the relation of the Hebrews and the Israelites, Hebrew is a wider term than Israel. Böhl believes that all Israelites are Hebrews, but not all Hebrews Israelite.[2] Jirku is strongly against him and says twice in his article, that Böhl's statement is not right.[3]

However, our interest is confined to the relation of Israel, the term being broadly representative of the descendants of Jacob, to the larger Hebrew group. The Ḫabiru of the Amarna Letters, though they may be Hebrews,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 363.

[2] Kanaanäer und Hebräer, p. 82.

[3] Die Wanderungen der Hebräer, p. 12, p. 31.

are not all Israelites, for they conquer the Amorites in Lebanon, and attack the Phoenician cities, and their gods played an important part in the treaty of the Hittites with Mitanni.[1] On the other hand, Hebrews in Canaan are most likely Israelites, for we know no other Hebrews there: and this conclusion is confirmed by the fact that two centuries later than the Amarna Age, Merneptah mentions Israel in the same region where in the Amarna Letters we find the Ḫabiru.[2]

Now, we cannot leave the subject of the Hittite movement relating to their racial movements without further discussion.

Forrer[3] points out, on the basis of the decipherment of the Boghaz-köi texts and of the north Syrian hieroglyphic inscriptions, that the original Hatti or proto-Hittites, to whom alone the name Hittite properly applies, were the indigenous population of northern Asia Minor, speaking a non-Indo-European language akin to those of the north-eastern Caucasus. About 2000 B. C., they founded an empire in Asia Minor whose capital was Boghaz-köi. About 1354 B. C., the Hittite nation was extended by king Soppilulioma as far as northern Syria, and the northern Lebanon. Forrer definitely states:

---

[1]See above, Ch. II, i.

[2]See Jack, The Date of the Exodus, p. 232, n. 3. "The name Isre-il or Isre-el has been found on a Babylonian cylinder-seal of the era of Naram-Sin (c. 2680), several hundred years before the patriarch Jacob. ---."

[3]"The Hittites in Palestine", QSt, 1936, p. 194.

> At no time did any district south of the northern ends of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon belong to the Hittite-Empire, either as a federal or a dependent state; all the country south of this frontier remained under Egyptian suzerainty. Hence there was no 'Hittite' state at all in Syria before 1359 B. C., and there was no 'Hittite' state whatsoever south of the said Lebanon frontier at any time, nor did any army of the Hatti king enter Palestine proper at any time.[1]

Therefore, the so-called Hittites whom we find in Palestine are different from the Proto or original Hittites.

Forrer distinguishes five different kinds of Hittites by numerals, as follows:[2]

a) Hittites I. Proto-Hattians, called Hittites by themselves.

b) Hittites II Kanisians, Nasians, or Nesians, called Hittite by their neighbors.

c) Hittites III Tabalians, called Hittites by the Assyrians.

d) Hittites IV The people of Kurustama in Palestine.

e) Hittites V By this term we denote those so-called Hittites who never existed in ancient times, and who are only to be found in certain late books, in places, times and civilizations which were never Hittite I, II, III, or IV.

The name "Hittite" in Palestine, therefore, has two separate origins. In the first place the people of the Tabalians. In 1191 the Hittite empire fell by the invasion

---

[1] Ibid., p. 194 cf. Sayce's evidence (Biblical World, Feb. 1905, pp. 130 ff.) in proof that the Hittites were already settled in southern Palestine at least as early as the Twelfth Egyptian Dynasty (c. 2000-1788 B. C.) breaks down under the criticism of Breasted, AJSL, XXI, (1905), pp. 153-158. See Burney, Judges, pp. Lxxxvi-Lxxxvii.

[2] Ibid., p. 196.

of the sea-peoples, and they lost their territory in Asia Minor and northern Syria.

In the annals of Ramses III, the destruction of the Hittite empire is described. We read:

> The sea-peoples dispersed themselves from their islands destroying every land. No country could resist them, neither Hatti, nor Qdj (i.e., Halab), nor Carchemish, nor Arzawa (Cilicia), nor Alasija (Cyprus), which were smitten in pieces. They set up a camp together in the midst of the land of Amurru, whose people were ruined. They came against Egypt, the Philistines, the Zakkari, the Sakalasa, the Danaans, the Wasasa, i. e., all countries, were their confederates. They laid hands on the countries in the whole circuit of the earth, and they boasted of their hearts' desire, saying 'our plans prosper'.[1]

The use of the name Hittite for the Tabalians of northern Syria was taken over by the Israelites from the Aramaeans, who in their turn had taken over the name Hittite from the Assyrians.[2] Forrer points out that the following three Biblical passages seem to bear witness to the use of the name Hittites for the Tabalian kingdoms in northern Syria:

i) I Kings X, 29 (2 Chron. 1, 17)
ii) I Kings XI, 1 Date, 950 B. C.
iii) 2 Kings VII,6 Date, 841 B. C.

All the other references to the Hittites in the Bible refer to a non-Semitic element of the population of Palestine whose ancestor was supposed to be Heth. They were the people of Kurustamma who were called Hittites after the empire of the Kanisian Hittites to which they escaped. Geographically, only four points of this Hittite

---

[1] Forrer, QSt, 1936, pp. 194-195.

[2] QSt, 1937, p. 115.

territory in Palestine are known.

i) Hebron. (Gen. xxiii, 3, 5, 7, 10, 16, 18, 20; xxv, 9, 10; xLix, 29, 32; L, 13).

From the context it is clear that the Hittites constituted the whole population of Hebron, since Abraham calls himself a foreigner (gēr גֵּר) and a settler (tōshāb תּוֹשָׁב) (Gen. xxiii, 4), while the Hittites are called "natives" (עַם-הָאָרֶץ) (Gen. xxiii, 7, 12), i. e., the ruling population of the country.

ii) Beersheba; Esau, the son of Isaac, married Judith, the daughter of Beeri, the Hittite, and Basemath, the daughter of Elon, the Hittite (Gen. xxvi, 34), and his mother Rebecca calls them "indigenous" (Gen. xxviii, 46). This leaves no doubt that the indigenous population round Beersheba was Hittite, because there is no indication that Esau got his wives from outside, e. g., from Hebron.[1]

iii) Jerusalem; we have evidence for Hittites in Jerusalem, whose "father was an Amorite" and whose "mother was a Hittite" (Ezek. xvi, 3, 45,). This means that a Hittite city was taken by Amorite, and not the reverse. Abdi-Ḫiba, the king of Jerusalem, is considered as a Hittite by many scholars. (see, p. 1, n. 1)

iv) Bethel; in Judges i, 22-26, Luz was in the land of the Hittites. (This is doubtful).[2]

---

[1]According to Gen. xxxvi, 2-3, Esau married Canaanite wives. Forrer rejects it as not a historical narrative. QSt, 1936, p. 199, n. 15.

[2]QSt, 1936.

Forrer believes that they must have come in at earlier times in connection with the invasion of the Hurrians from upper Mesopotamia.[1]

Concerning the name of the city Hebron, Clay gives an interesting interpretation. At the time of Abraham, the city of Hebron was called Mamre, (See, Gen. XXIII, 17-19), where the children of Heth lived (Gen. XXIII). In connection with the Ḫabiru and Hittites, it is not impossible that the name Hebron (Ḫebrôn) is a formation on ôn (=ân) from the word Ḫabir(i), like Shimshôn from Shemesh. Moreover, he says, the city received its name in the period of Hittite ascendancy. He also presupposes the identification of the Ḫabiru with Hittites.[2] But it seems to me that Clay goes too far. Because, however they are mentioned, the Ḫabiru are evidently foreigners (גֵּר and תּוֹשָׁב): in the west they are not Hittites or Canaanites, in the east they cannot be classed with the citizens of Arrapḫa or of Babylon. As Speiser says, they are strangers without a country and nomads in a certain sense.[3]

Sayce regards the Ḫabiru as "Hittite condottieri". He takes references in the Amarna Letters to the land of Kaššu to refer to the land of the Hittites. And he claims that the Kaši people of Abdi-Ḫiba's letter are identified

---

[1] QSt, 1937, p. 114.

[2] The Empire of the Amorites, p.

[3] AASOR, XIII, p. 36.

with the Ḫabiru in the passage in which the writer, having accused Milkili and the sons of Labaya of giving the king's land to the Ḫabiru.[1]

As we have noticed already, the sons of Arzawa and the sons of Labaya were in league with the SA·GAZ (Ḫabiru) in rebellion against the authority of Egypt. The sons of Arzawa and the sons of Labaya were Hittite,[2] who may have belonged to the Hittite II empire of Asia Minor by the clasification of Forrer.[3]

Langdon adopts the same view that they (SA·GAZ or Ḫabiru) were employed as "professional mercenary soldiers" in the Hittite army in Syria.[4] They appeared in later time as independent raiders in Syria and Palestine. Forrer concludes that there is neither any mention of them nor any letter from south-Palestinian Hittites among the Amarna-Letters. Hence at the time of the Amarna Letters there was no Hittites in southern Palestine, i. e., up to the last years of Amenophis IV, who died in 1352 B. C.. Thus the Hittites of Palestine cannot be an aboriginal population, but must be immigrants who came to Palestine after the Tell

---

[1] ET, XV, 1903, pp. 282 f., see above Ch. II, ii.

[2] Burney, Judges, p. LXXXIII - LXXXIV.

[3] QSt, 1937, p. 101, "Among the forty-four mentions of the Hatti in the Amarna Letters there is not one which could refer to anything but the Hittite II empire of Asia Minor".

[4] ET, XXXI, 1920, pp. 326-327.

el-Amarna period.[1] Thus, the so-called Hittites in southern Palestine before Tell el-Amarna Letters were not original Hittite, and they cannot owe their existence to the political strength of the Hittite empire in Syria. After the Amarna Age, that is, in 1353 B. C. the people of Kurustamma came to Palestine as fugitives from the Gasga-territory in Asia Minor.[2] It is probable that the Habiru came with them as fugitives, or wanderers playing the same rôle.[3] As in Asia Minor, the gods of Ḫabiru played an important part in the treaty of the Hittites with Mitanni,[4] in Palestine they might have the close relationships at the time of Ḫabiru invasion.[5]

---

[1] QSt, 1937, p. 102. The fact that no occurrence of the Hittite name does not prove that there was no Hittite. This argument is very weak.

[2] Forrer, QSt, 1937, p. 115.

[3] The wives of Isaac and Jacob must be of Aramaean stock; the ancestor of the Israelites is remembered as a "wandering Aramaean". Deut. 26:5. The meaning "fugitive" suits the context as well as "wandering". Speiser, AASOR, XIII, p. 43.

[4] Winckler has given a preliminary account of the extraordinary treaties made by the kings of Hatti with Mittanni, Nuhasse, and Kizzuwadni. See Langdon, ET, XXXI, p. 326.

[5] Though they have so close relationship, there is no law strictly parallel to Hebrew law with Hittite law. Hence the origin of Hebrew law is not to be found in the Hittite's code. See Meek, Hebrew Origins, pp. 57 f. Cf. J. M. P. Smith's, The Origin and History of Hebrew Law, Chicago, 1931, pp.246-279.

CHAPTER VI

THE ḤABIRU (HEBREWS) IN PALESTINE

i The First Migration

The Negebite or Terachite Theory: El-god.

In 1933, M. Virolleaud published a Ras Shamra poem on the "Birth of the Gracious and Beautiful Gods",[1] in which he gave the so-called "Negebite Theory". According to this theory, he supposes that the ancestors of the Phoenicians and Israelites lived side by side in southern Palestine early in the second millennium B. C.. Jack introduces this theory in his book "The Ras Shamra Tablets" , pp. 38-44. We read:

> O plain (of the) Negeb!
> The army is going to war, the army of the Negeb!
> It is going to war, O plain (?), the flower of
> thine army:
> A great force of three hundred times ten thousand,
> With harpés of copper,
> With doggers (Šnn) of bronze (hg ?)

This army appears to have been led by an individual whose name is written Krt (Kereth), who is the hero of this poem. He was the Phoenician king of Sidon, and also a son of the god El. The battle was with the followers of Terah (whom we may call the Terahites), and these are taken by Virolleaud, Dussaud, and others (mostly French scholars) to be the "Abrahamites", i.e. the Hebrews under Abraham, the son of Terah. In one passage, and in only one, these invaders are designated under the name ʿIbrim. We have

---

[1] Syria, XIV, (1933), pp. 128-151.

the following expression: "k ksp lᶜbrm zt, ḫrṣ lᶜbrm kś". Virolleaud[1] has interpreted this passage as follows:

> the olive (is precious ?) as money for the ᶜbrm, and the k ́s (other name for trees without doubt) (is precious?) (as), the gold for the ᶜbrm

He suggests that ᶜbrm (עברם) simply means "The people who passed". We cannot say, therefore, that this people are the nomads, or better the Hebrews, or the Ḫabiru of the Tell el-Amarna.

Jack emphasizes the remarkable correspondence of the two traditions, i. e., that of the Terahites (the followers of the moon-god Teraḫ) and that of the Biblical Teraḫ (the father of Abraham).

Albright has discussed this subject in detail and denies the Keret or Negebite theory.[2] His version of the story of Krt is entirely different from that of Virolleaud. He finds no evidence that Krt was regarded as a Sidonian king, nor is there the slightest probability that the Cherethites of the Negeb derived their name from Krt rather than from Crete. He concludes that the whole Negebite theory of Phoenician origins has as little foundation archaeologically or otherwise as the Negebite theory of Israel's origins.

Albright also refers to two other antagonists of this theory.[3] Père R. de Vaux of the École Biblique in

---

[1] Syria, XV, (1934), p. 317, n. 1.

[2] BASOR, No. 63, 1936, pp. 23-32.

[3] "Recent Progress in North-Canaanite Research", BASOR, No. 70, 1938, pp. 22-24.

Jerusalem[1] and Prof. W. Baumgartner of Basel.[2] De Vaux correctly recognizes the improbability of the hypothesis that Udmu in the Keret text is to be identified with biblical Edom.[3]

Baumgartner points out that Keret is not called "king of the Sidonians", and that we should read the phrase simply "from my house". While Tyre and Sidon are clearly mentioned in the epic, there is no hint that Keret was king of either place.[4]

In a later article Albright again rejects the Negebite hypothesis along with the Terahite hypothesis.[5] Thus, the hypothesis that the ancestors of Phoenicians and Israelites lived side by side in southern Palestine early in the second millennium B. C. seems to be rejected. However, there is another argument that as early as the beginning of the second millennium B. C. a population which may be called Hebrew had a footing in the extreme south of Palestine. This interesting view is held by Jirku and Cerney who base their theory on the discovery of Palestinian names in early Egyptian texts. This agrees with the narrative of Genesis which describes the wandering and sojourn of Abraham in the

---

[1] RB, 1937, pp. 362-372, 440-447, 526-555.

[2] Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXIII, 1938, pp. 12-15.

[3] Albright, op. cit., p. 23.

[4] Op. cit., p. 23.

[5] BASOR, No. 71, 1938, pp. 35-40.

south of Negeb of Judah. Jack suggests that many of these Hebrews may have found employment in the mines of Edom and Sinai long before Jacob and his family went down into Egypt.[1]

Albright has noted that Transjordan, especially Ḥaurân, eastern Gilead, Moab, and Edom, was in fact the home of a very old sedentary culture.[2] As Horsfield has shown, not only eastern Moab but eastern Edom too had a sedentary population during the Bronze Age and also possessed copper mines. This statement does not prove that the Hebrews lived in these districts in the second millenium B. C., but it suggests that some Hebrews might have been employed in these mines.[3]

It is true, as Alt has shown, that the Israelites did not at first occupy the Canaanite city-states in Western Palestine, but settled in the unoccupied hill districts and only later under the pressure of necessary expansion did they conquer the Canaanite states. Hebrew tradition accounts for this by saying (Judges I: 19) that the Canaanites were too strong and it was only when the Israelites had become powerful that they ventured an attack on the former and won.[4]

---

[1] QSt, 1937, p. 160.

[2] JPOS, XII, p. 258.

[3] Cf. BASOR, No. 43, p. 22; Glueck, N. "Further Explorations in Eastern Palestine" BASOR, No. 51, 1933, pp. 9-18; No. 55, 1934, pp. 3-21.

[4] Bergman, JAOS, LIV, 1934, p. 173, Glueck believes that the Exodus of the Israelites through southern Transjordan could not have taken place before the thirteenth

Bergman has proved that, in the Bronze Age, Machir and Gad, who originally settled in a land relatively uninhabited, were pioneer settlers north and south of the Jabbok while Reuben conquered an inhabited land previously held by Sihon. If the emendation of חַוֹּתֵיהֶם (Nu. 32: 41) to חות הם (tent-villages of Ham) should be correct, then Jair's settlement will be south of the upper Yarmûk between Der'ah and Jerash in eastern Gilead. However, whether the conquest of Ham is connected with the Mosaic conquest of Bashan we cannot tell.[1] As we have seen above, if the events of Genesis 14 where Abraham, the Hebrew, is mentioned are historical, and if Abraham is a contemporary with Hammurabi or only a little later than Hammurabi, it would be true that certain branch of the Hebrews lived in the south-eastern part of Palestine, especially the south-east of the Dead Sea, about the beginning of the Second millennium B. C..

Again, if the story of Abraham in Hebron (Mamre) (Gen. XXIII, 17-19) is historical and true, Abraham was a Ḫabiru and came to Hebron about the beginning of the Second millennium B. C.. As Forrer suggests,[2] this Abraham tribe must have come in connection with the invasion of the Hurrians from upper Mesopotamia through the

---

century B. C.. See BASOR, No. 55, 1934, pp. 16-17.

[1] Ibid., p. 176.

[2] QSt, 1937, p. 114.

southeastern part of Palestine.

We cannot overlook the fact that the deity of the sanctuary of Jerusalem was El-elion (אל-עליון , Gen. 14: 19).[1] The God of Abraham seems to be (אל-עליון Gen. 14: 22), not Yahweh.[2] The view that the Biblical אל-עליון is identical with אלאין in the Ras Shamra Tablets is held by the many scholars, including Albright[3] and Hans Bauer.[4]

The seat of the Biblical אל-עליון and the אלאין בעל in the Ras Shamra Tablets was in the "remote parts of the north" (ṣrrt ṣpn, where ṣrrt is probably from the Babylonian ṣurru, "heart", i. e. "remote parts"),[5] and it was doubtless the sacred Mount of Assembly referred to by Isaiah (14: 13 ff) and Ezekiel (28:14, 16). "I will ascend into heaven ... above the stars of El, and I will sit upon the Mount of Assembly, in the

---

[1]Salem in Gen. 14: 18 is usually understood to be an archaic name for Jerusalem. (Josephus, Ant. 1: 180; Ps. 76: 3). Jerusalem was already called Uru-salim in the Amarna Letters, (see Driver, Genesis, pp. 164-165; Skinner, Genesis, p. 270).

[2]In "יהוה אל עליון קנה שמים וארץ" of Gen. 14: 22, the יהוה is probably an addition to the text, wanting in 'the LXX' and the 'Syriac Version'. While the 'Samaritan Reccension of the Pent.' has האלהים . See Skinner, ibid., p. 271.

[3]JPOS, XII, p. 190.

[4]ZATW, L, 1932, p. 96.

[5]Albright, JPOS, XVII, also Jack, The Ras Shamra Tablets, p. 20.

remote parts of the north ... " (Isa. 14: 13 f.) The two principal gods in the Ras Shamra Tablets are El and Ba'al, and El in the Old Testament is God the "God of Israel" (Gen. 33: 20) and in Gen. 46: 3 we read: "I am El, the God of thy father" or "Elohim said, Make an altar for El who appeared to thee" (Gen. 35: 1-3). אלעין (Aleyn) is a son of Ba'al, and poems I and II of the Ras Shamra Tablets were clearly written to be recited at festivals of Aleyn at Aphek (Josh. 13: 4), the Aphaca of Lucian, while Poem III is, G. A. Barton believes, a liturgy originally written for the spring festival at Jerusalem about 1800 - 1600 B. C..[1] If we take the later date of Abraham, the date of this Poem III is the same with that of Abraham. It is noteworthy that the whole scene of Poem III, according to Barton, is in southern Palestine, reaching as far south as Kadesh in the wilderness.[2] In addition to this, the discovery by Dr. Grant at Beth-Shemesh during the summer of 1933 of a tablet in this same script in a stratum of the same age as that in which the tablets at Ugarit were found, is proof that a people employing the same alphabet and worshipping the same supreme god, El, was still in southern Palestine at the time these liturgies were being copied at Ugarit, i. e., about 1400-1375 B. C..[3] The statement above

---

[1] Barton, Archaeology and the Bible, p. 353.

[2] Op. cit., p. 353.

[3] BASOR, No. 52, 1933, pp. 3-5.

will throw light on the theory that the Ḫabiru brought with them to Palestine from Mesopotamia the use of Elohim. In the tablets from Boghaz-köi, the god of the Ḫabiru is written as ilâni Ḫabiri. Ilâni SA·GAZ equal to ilâni Ḫabiri occurs in the Accadian texts of the treaties of Subbiluliuma (Shuppiluliu), king of the Hittites and Mattiuaza, king of Mitanni, and in treaties in Hittite between Mursilis and Manapa-Dattas (KUB, xix, No. 50, 14, 20) as ilâni Ḫa-bi-ra-as, and in a treaty between Muwattalis and Alaksandus of Wilusa as ilâni Ḫa-bi-ri-ya-as (KUB, xxi, No. 1, iv, 20). "ilâni" is employed as gods in the El-Amarna tablets too.[1] The Pharaoh is addressed by his Canaanite vassals as "my gods, my sun-god". Here, according to Albright, we can see the appearance of monotheistic tendencies in Asia. In Canaanite usage, the totality of gods was called elôhim or elônîm, terms which meant both "gods" and "totality of manifestations of god". "Gods" is naturally an inexact translation of the same word which was used by the purely monotheistic Hebrews in the sense of "God".[2]

It may also be observed that none of the formerly accepted occurrences of the name Yahweh in theophorous compounds of the Bronze Age are now admitted by competent

---

[1]See Langdon, The Mythology of All Races, "Semetic". Boston, 1931. Criticism by Barton, G. A., in JQR, XXIV, 1933, pp. 81-85.

[2]Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, pp. 165-166.

scholars.[1]

As we will see in the following pages, gods or God of the Hebrews in Palestine until at least 1000 B. C. seems to be El by archaeological evidences.

Palestine and Syria were conquered and made Egyptian provinces under the reigns of Amenhotep I, Thutmose I, and Thutmose III (c. 1468 B. C.) and the Egyptian arms were carried far into Mesopotamia.[2] Thutmose III in his list of conquered tribes mentions Y (a) -ʿ-q(e)-b-ʾâ-ra and Y(a)-šа-p-ʾ(e)-ra.[3] There is general agreement that the first represents יעקב-אל, Jacob-el, and another (rather doubtfully) יוסף-אל.[4] These names give some suggestion that some Israelites perhaps had given their names to sites in southern or central Canaan (c. 1500 B. C.). The form of

---

[1]Albright, ibid., p. 164.

[2]"For this date see Borchardt, Die Mittel zur zeitlichen Festlegung von Punkten der ägyptischen Geschichte und ihre Anwendung (Cairo, 1935), especially pp. 78 ff. Edgerton's valuable criticism of Borchardt's book (AJSL, LIII, 188-197) reaches the conclusion that this date is at present the most probable of several theoretical alternatives (p. 196); it is eleven years later than the one adopted by Meyer and Breasted. Edgerton's date for the accession of Amosis I would be cir. 1571/0, since he dates the accession of Amenophis I in the year 1546/5." quoted from Albright, (BASOR, No. 68, 1937, p. 22, n. 2).

[3]Breasted, Ancient Records, II, pp. 163 ff, "In the long list of south Syrian places inscribed on the pylons of the temple at Karnak".

[4]Paton, Israel's conquest of Canaan, JBL, XXXII, 1913, p. 36. Jack,ibid., p. 36, n. 2.

the names was not uncommon. As Jack points out,[1] we find Jezre'ēl, Jabne'ēl (Josh. XV. 11 - Jabneh, 2 Chron. XXVI, 6) Yiphtah'ēl (Josh. XIX, 14, 27 - Yiphtah, Judg. XI, 1 ff.), Yekabze'ēl (Neh. XI, 25), Yirpe'ēl (Josh. XVIII, 27), etc. Such constructions make it probable that the names Jacob and Joseph are elliptical forms of a more original Jacob-el, Joseph-el, which had reference to God (El). We must notice that there is evidence that the two names were in existence long before these patriarchs were born. Dr. Pinches, as Jack mentions,[2] has discovered the personal name Yaʿkub-ilu[3] on the contract tablets of the time of the Babylonian king Sin-muballit, the predecessor of Hammurabi, as early as about 2090 B. C., and the contracted or hypocoristic form Yaʿkubu (exactly like 'Jacob') also occurs.[4] Jack, therefore, doubts if the place-names Jacob-el and Joseph-el in southern Syria, assuming the reading of them to be correct, prove the existence of what may be called Israelite tribes in that district in the reign of Thutmose III (c. 1500 B. C.). It is admitted by all scholars, Burney included, that the Joseph tribes can hardly have been in Canaan at this date;[5] as for Jacob-el, all that may be

---

[1] Op. cit.,

[2] Ibid., p. 232.

[3] Similarly we find Yasup-ilu, Yarbi-ilu, Yamlik-ilu, Yakhar-ilu, etc. on the tablets of the same age. Jack, ibid., p. 232, n. 1.

[4] Hommel, Ancient Hebrew Tradition, pp. 61, 96, 112, 203.

[5] Burney, Israel's Settlement in Canaan, p. 89.

safely concluded from it is that some Semitic chieftain had implanted his name on a place in Palestine or that some of his descendants had done so. But whether the place was inhabited by tribes who could be described as Israelites, we have no means of determination. However, so far as we can infer from the name, their god seems to be El.

In Palestine, the Yahweh cult was introduced after Moses. Even the Hebrews with Moses in Egypt, had absolutely no previous knowledge of Yahweh.[1] According to Meek, the name of Moses' mother, Jochebed, is unquestionably a Yahweh name, and Yahweh was early known to the Hebrews at least in some circles close to Moses. It is a striking fact that not a single personal name with Yahweh as an element appears with the Hebrews until Jochebed and very few thereafter until the time of David.[2] The almost complete absence of Yahweh names among the early Hebrews would indicate quite clearly that there was no general worship of Yahweh among them.

There are, however, other arguments. Friedrich Delitzsch thought he had discovered the god Yahweh in cuneiform literature long antedating the time of Moses,

---

[1]Meek, Hebrew Origins, p. 91. He states that the Hebrews with Moses in Egypt were the Levites. The stories regarding Moses are classified and located in their proper literary and historical categories in Gressmann's Mose und seine Zeit, Ein Kommentar zu den Mose-Sagen, Göttingen, 1913.

[2]Ibid., p. 91. Cf. Gray, Hebrew Proper Names, pp. 181 ff., 190 ff.

antedating in fact the time of Abraham.[1] According to Meek, the personal name Yawi-ilum which Delitzsch interpreted as "Yahweh is god", in all probability means simply "God causes to be", being manifestly only a variant writing of Yahwi-ilum,[2] of which Yawium is a hypocoristicon and not to be interpreted with Delitzsch as meaning "belonging to Yahweh".

Another personal name that Delitzsch and others thought contained the god name Yahweh is Yaum-ilum. Still another name in cuneiform that scholars have regarded as containing Yahweh as an element is Abu-yami, which occurs on a tablet found at Taanach and dated about 2000 B. C., but Yami appears nowhere else as the cuneiform equivalent of Yahu or Yahweh, and it is much more likely the god Ym that appears in the Ras Shamra texts[3] and in the biblical name Yemuel (Ym is god).[4] Meek shows how it is impossible to equate Yau and Yawi with Yahweh.[5] Another identification of the Babylonian god Ea with Yahweh also is impossible.[6]

---

[1] Babel and Bible, 1903, Meek, ibid., p. 96.

[2] Cf. Bauer, Die Ostkanaanäer, pp. 61, 74 a.

[3] Bauer, ZATW, LI, 1933, p. 92.

[4] Cf. also Driver, ZATW, XLVI, p. 7, n. 1, who shows how impossible it is to equate Yami and Yahweh.

[5] Ibid., pp. 96-97.

[6] Cf. Godbey, The Lost Tribes: A Myth, pp. 562 ff. Godbey makes Yahweh a god of Hurrian origin. Meek, ibid., p. 98.

Meek concludes that there is no clear evidence for the occurrence of Yahweh in cuneiform literature earlier than the eighth century B. C.. The same view is held by Luckenbill,[1] Daiches,[2] and Driver.[3] Meek continues that no clear evidence for the occurrence of the name outside the Old Testament earlier than the ninth century (on the Moabite Stone and the ostraca from Samaria), with the possible exception of the Ras Shamra texts, where the god Yw (יו) appears in a text as yet published, and this god Gaster would identify with Yahweh.[4] Therefore, the Yahweh cult was introduced after Moses, and the Habiru had brought their God "El" or "Elohim" with the Hurrians into Palestine from the north about 1800 B. C.. Meek identifies this migration with the Abrahamic.[5] This is considered as the first migration of the Hebrew people into Palestine.

ii The Second Migration

The second migration is considered as the settlement of the Habiru in Palestine as revealed in the Tell el-Amarna Letters which is so exactly parallel to the Old Testament account of the Israelite conquest of Jericho and the invasion of the highlands of Ephraism under Joshua

---

[1] AJT, XXN, pp. 24 ff.

[2] Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, XXII, pp. 125 ff.

[3] ZATW, XLVI, pp. 7 ff.

[4] Ibid., pp. 98-99.

[5] Hebrew Origins, pp. 7, 14.

that the two must manifestly have reference to the same episode.[1]

According to Franz Böhl, Jericho, Gilgol, Shechem, Gibeon, Shiloh, Mizpah, and Bethel were doubtless by the time of the Amarna Letters in the hands of the invading Haribu, because we have no letter in the Amarna collection from these towns as we do from other near-by towns.[2] But, according to Barton, the Ḫabiru in the El-Amarna period had secured for themselves northern and southern Palestine, leaving central Palestine, where the tribes of Ephraim, Manasseh, and Benjamin afterward obtained a foothold.[3]

L. B. Paton who summarized the literature on this subject up to the year 1913 in JBL, XXXII, pp. 1-53, holds that there were two conquests, one in the Amarna period, and the other about 1200 B. C..

Jack supposes that all the Hebrew tribes entered Palestine in the Amarna period from the southern Palestine[4]

---

[1] In Josh. 9: 3 ff., Gibeon's alliance with the Hebrews parallel to the actions of Labaya, Milkili, Tagi and other reported in the Amarna Letters as allying themselves with the Ḫabiru. Jgs. I: 27, 29, 31, 33,-- this is precisely the evidence of the Amarna Letters. Cf. Josh. 13: 13; 15: 63; 16:10; 17:11 f., 14 f.; Judges 1: 8, 21, 30; 3:6.

[2] Kanaanäer u. Hebräer, pp. 67 f.

[3] JBL, XLVIII, 1929, p. 145.

[4] The Date of the Exodus.

According to Burney, only the Joseph tribes (Ephraim, Manasseh, Benjamin) were settled in Egypt and were led by Joshua across Jordan, while the other Israelite tribes continued in Palestine without a break. The Zilpah tribes (God, Asher) and Bilhah tribes (Dan, Naphtali), with Reuben, Zebulun, Issachar, and a nucleus of Judah, were in Palestine all along, while Simeon and Levi were in the desert to the west of Edom.[1] Petrie holds it probable that some parties of Israelites at least remained in Palestine during most of the time that the others sojourned in Egypt.[2]

Olmstead makes the Hebrew invasion a part of the larger Ḫabiru movement. He identifies Joshua with a Yoshuya mentioned in one of the Amarna Letters and makes him the leader of certain Hebrew tribes (Ephraim) that invaded Palestine about 1400 B. C.. He places Moses some two hundred years later as the leader of another group of tribes (Levi) in southern Palestine. Olmstead believes that Yahwism was of southern origin and gradually made its way into the north.[3] He said that the Hebrews had no geographical nor tribal and religious unity and that they had never reached the sea or even the fertile coastral plain. One tribe fought against the other Hebrew tribe as often

---

[1] Israel's Settlement in Canaan, pp. 36, 84. and see map V.

[2] Egypt and Israel, p. 35.

[3] History of Palestine and Syria, 1931, pp. 201-265.

as against a non-Hebrew tribe.[1]

Barton identifies the Ḫabiru of the Amarna Letters with the Leah tribes as Steuernagel has done, and supposes that it was the Rachel tribes who were in Egypt.[2] The effort of the Ḫabiru to conquer central Palestine failed, and it was left a fair field for the campaigns of Joshua,[3] i.e., the territory of Ephraim, Benjamin, and Manasseh was still inhabited by Canaanites and Hittites in the time of Joshua, and were accordingly fair prey for the invading Rachel tribes some two hundred years later.[4]

According to Meek, the Hebrews came into Palestine in two waves, one from the northeast with the Hurrians about 1800 B. C. which we have known above, the other from the east about 1400 B. C.. They were not an ethnic unit, but a composite group, perhaps more Aramean than anything else, if we can trust the statement in Deut. 26:5, " A nomad (wandering) Aramean was my father." (See above Ch. V:ii). Meek identifies the latter with the Israelite (Jacob). Joshua was connected with this migration. They formed a confederacy and adopted a simple code of Laws

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 270 f.

[2] JBL, XLVIII, 1929, pp. 144-145; Steuernagel, Die Einwanderungen der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan, Berlin, 1901, p. 123.

[3] Barton, ibid., p. 148.

[4] Ibid., p. 147.

near Shechem.[1] Meek makes Yoshuya in the Amarna Letter as the cuneiform equivalent of Joshua, but he says that there is no ground for identifying the two men.[2] Abdi-Ḫiba's letter does not say that Shechem was conquered by the Ḫabiru, and the attempts of the Ḫabiru upon this region seem to have been unsuccessful.[3] Meek and Albright states that although the excavation of Shechem has not been very well conducted, and the results are disappointing, the excavations of this site seem to show a somewhat later date than 1400 B. C. for its occupation by the Hebrews.[4]

Albright indicates quite definitely a date of the Israelite conquest somewhere in the thirteenth century, the second phase of Late Bronze. The city was destroyed by a tremendous conflagration which shows that the strength of the Hebrews had grown by that time. This is one of the most terrific conflagrations in the whole of Palestine and we are compelled to identify it with the Israelite conquest.[5]

---

[1]Meek, ibid., pp. 25 ff. "From early times, Shechem was a centre of Canaanite religious life. Its patron deity was Baal Berith, "Lord of the Covenant", also called El Berith, the "God of the Covenant". See Olmstead, ibid., p. 106, cf. Waterman, "Pre-Israelite Laws in the Book of the Covenant", AJSL, XXXVIII,(1921), pp. 36-54.

[2]BASOR, No. 61, 1936, pp. 17-19.

[3]Kn, Nos. 286-290.

[4]For critical review see Hempel, ZATW, LI, pp 159-169, and also BASOR, No. 61, 1936, pp. 17-19.

[5]"The Kyle Memorial Excavation at Bethel" BASOR, No. 56, 1934, pp. 1-15, No. 58, pp. 10 ff.

In the Old Testament, there is an elaborate account of the capture of Ai,[1] and only a brief reference to that of Bethel,[2] but the latest excavations at Ai show that the site was unoccupied from the Early Bronze Age to Early Iron I (i.e., from c. 2000 to c. 1000 B. C.).[3]

M. Dussaud, as a result of the excavations at Ai, states that the site remained unoccupied during the whole of the Middle and Late Bronze Age, that is, from 2000 - 1200 B. C., the name ha-Ay (Ha-ʿai) "the ruin" in Hebrew, can only have been given to the site after the destruction of the city, that is, after 2000 B. C. From this, Mme. Marquet, the excavator, concludes that the site was desolate when the Israelites began the conquest of Canaan; the result of the excavations at Jericho, also prove that this city was already destroyed when the Israelites appeared before it.[4] The heroic narrative of Joshua VIII and VIII seems to be as an unhistorical, legendary and ritual product.

Père Vincent, however, contends that there is no contradiction between these archaeological facts and the Biblical record in Joshua VII - VIII. The site, (Et-Tell) was already a "ruin" (ʿai) when the Israelites captured it, although a later embellishment of the tradition has supplied it with a king. He thinks the forces

---

[1]Josh. 7: 2-8; 29.

[2]Judges 1:22-25.

[3]See Albright, BASOR, No. 56, 1934, p. 11

[4]QSt, 1936, p. 54.

of Bethel, and perhaps of some other neighbouring towns, took up a position in "the Ruin-ʿAi" whose walls still presented a formidable appearance and there, at the head of the pass, awaited the invasion from Jericho. With the capture of "the Ruin-ʿAi", the fall of Bethel would naturally follow.[1]

Concerning the date of the fall of Jericho, there has been much discussion.[2]

The date given by Garstang is 1407 B. C..[3] In January 1930, Garstand undertook for the express purpose of solving the chronological problem of the conquest in the light of our present knowledge of ceramic chronology, and the best summaries of the debate have been given by Vincent in his article in Revue Biblique, XXXIX, 1930, pp. 403-433; XLIV, pp. 583-605. Vincent concludes that the date of the fall of Jericho is later half of thirteenth century.[4] Albright believes that the date is between the death of Amenophis III and the accession of Sethos I, because the fact that nothing is said about the fall of Jericho in the Amarna Letters which come to end before 1360 B. C., though not itself decisive, against dating it between 1380 and 1360. He, therefore, dates this

---

[1] RB, XLVI, 1937, pp. 231-266.

[2] As the dates given by the German excavators are acknowledged to be wrong, I have omitted the discussion of them.

[3] Foundations of the Bible History, pp. 61 f, 146 f; QSt, LXVII, pp. 61 ff; Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology, XX, 3 ff, XXI, 99 ff.

[4] Albright, BASOR, No. 58, 1935, p. 12. cf. Vincent,

event preferably between 1360-1320, in any case, in the fourteenth century.[1]

W. J. Phythian-Adams sums up the results of the examination both of the city and of its necropolis as follows:

1. The last walled city upon the site was destroyed about 1400 B. C.

2. It was completely destroyed by fire.

3. The walls of this city had been double, with houses built across and upon them.

4. And whether from bad building, undermining or earthquake shocks, they had fallen forward down the slope of the mound, with a violence.

5. The site was not reoccupied till the period of the Israelite monarchy.

All these facts and peculiarities, Phythian-Adams says, correspond with the facts contained in the narrative of Joshua and its echo in I Kings XVI: 34.[2]

This would simply indicate that the Hebrew occupation of central Palestine took even longer than we suggest. The Amarna account marks the beginning of the movement, while the Old Testament account has largely to do with its final accomplishment. As Burney suggests, that the two accounts are not contemporaneous is indicated by the fact that the Canaanite kings mentioned in the two

---

"The Chronology of Jericho", QSt, LXIII, 1931, 104 ff.

[1] BASOR, No. 58, 1935, pp. 12-13.

[2] "Jericho, Ai, Mount Ephraim", QSt, 1936, p. 142.

bear different names and so can not be of the same time.[1]

The identification of Tell ed-Duweir with ancient Lachish further complicates the question. For, though the Biblical records claim that Lachish was destroyed by Joshua soon after the fall of Jericho, the results of the archaeological study of this site show that, according to Albright, the city fell in 1231 B. C..[2]

Concerning the Israelite settlement in Megiddo, Albright states that there was a continuous occupation of Megiddo from the Middle Bronze Age to the fall of Megiddo VII, shortly after the year 1150 B. C.; there is a complete interruption in the history of the site, after which a new, relatively crude culture takes its place in stratum VI. This new culture is characterized by a pottery which is almost indistinguishable from contemporary Israelite pottery in Shechem, Shiloh, Bethel, Ai, Gibeah, and Beth-zur, etc., and must accordingly be Israelite. Then, he concludes that Megiddo VI, which may be dated from before (?) 1100 to after (?) 1050, is an Israelite settlement.[3]

Albright also believes that the Song of Deborah dates from between Megiddo VII and VI, in round numbers cir. 1125 B. C.. This would make it roughly a century

---

[1] Israel's Settlement in Canaan, p. 92.

[2] BASOR, No. 68, 1937, p. 25.

[3] Op. cit., p. 25.

later than the Israelite occupation of the Shephelah of Judah.[1]

The Israel stela, in which Marneptah boasts of having defeated the people Israel, comes from the year 1230, and the final catastrophe probably occurred shortly afterwards -- say 1230 B. C. in round numbers.[2]

In the monument erected by Merneptah,[3] it is said that "Israel is desolated, her seed is not". It should be noted that Israel is mentioned along with peoples and places in Palestine and Phoenicia.[4] In this inscription, the determinative sign for land accompanies the names Tehenu, Khela, Ashkelon, Gezer, and Yenoam, but the determinative for "people" is used with the name Israel, indicating that it denotes a people (the Israelites), not a city or country.[5] The essential fact for our present argument is that the Israelites, or the main body of them at least, are recognized in the inscription as being settled in Palestine by the time of Merneptah, and judging from the captured towns in the inscription, the

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 25.

[2] BASOR, No. 68, 1937, p. 24 cf. BASOR, No. 58, 1935, pp. 10 ff.

[3] Merneptah, date 1235-1227 B.C. by Albright; 1225-1215 B. C. by Breasted. The stela discovered by Petrie at Thebes in Egypt in 1896. This inscription contains the only mention of Israel in a document of this age outside the Bible.

[4] See Breasted's Ancient Records, III, pp. 264 ff; Barton's Archaeology and the Bible, p. 376; Jack's The Date of the Exodus, pp. 224-236.

[5] Jack, ibid., p. 225.

Israelite were in Central Palestine by this time, but not settled in any city.

About the middle of the fourteenth century, lists of North Syrian lands found in inscriptions of Seti I and Ramses II mention Asaru - the vowels are conjectured - and in a position which might suggest that a territory situated in that part of Canaan was occupied by the tribe of Asher. The identity of 'Asaru ('-s-r in Egyptian), however, Jack says, with Asher of the Biblical records must be regarded as most uncertain. The word 'Asaru is believed to be a translation, not from the Hebrew, but from some non-Semitic language;[1] and from the geographical standpoint of view, they are not identical.[2] However, Jack states, if the Israelites entered Canaan about 1400 B. C. or a little later, as the Amarna Letters go to prove, there was nothing to hinder the tribe of Asher being found in its assigned district by the time of Seti I, nearly 100 years later.[3]

iii The Third Migration

As the third immigration, there was a small tribe led by Moses from Egypt about 1200 B. C.[4] Investigations in Transjordan show that this region probably fell into their hands before 1400 B. C. at the beginning of the

---

[1] Cf. Eerdmans, Vorgeschichte, 1908, pp. 65 ff.

[2] Jack, ibid., pp. 230-231.

[3] Ibid., p. 231. Burney and Kittel are inclined to the same view, see Geschichte des Volkes Israel, I, p. 425.

[4] Meek, Hebrew Origins, pp. 33 ff.

Amarna Age.[1] Bergman suggests that the conquest of Transjordan under the leadership of Moses begins with the kingdom of Sihon (Nu. 21: 21 ff).[2] Albright also believes that the kingdom of Sihon in the region north of Arnon around Heshbon[3] was the first territory to be conquered by Israelites in Transjordan, and the southeastern parts of the Dead Sea, i. e., the regions of Moab and Edom, were almost entirely unoccupied by a sedentary population until the thirteenth and the twelfth centuries B. C., as Glueck's explorations have convincingly proved.[4] Because, according to Albright, the Moabites settled before the Israelites, and the scribe of Ramses II wrote the name "Moab" with the determinative "country", and the scribe of his successor Merneptah wrote the name "Israel" with the determinative for "people", yet the name "Moab" was originally a tribal name representing a personal name Yomo ab or the like.[5] Thus, Transjordan was in fact the home of a very old sedentary culture especially in the Hauran, eastern Gilead, Moab and Edom, but as Bergman and Alt admit, it is almost impossible to find the proper solution for the problem of

---

[1] Bergman, JAOS, LIV, 1934, pp. 169-177.

[2] Ibid., p. 169 f. Cf. Böhl, Kanaanäer u. Hebräer, pp. 60 ff; Gressmann, Mose u. seine Zeit, 1913, pp. 304 f.

[3] Sihon is used as parrallel to Heshbon; Nu. 21:28; Jer. 48: 45.

[4] BASOR, No. 51, p. 18; No. 55, pp. 12 f, 15 f; No. 58, p. 15.

[5] BASOR, No. 58, 1935, p. 15.

Eastern Palestine on account of the scarcity of material.[1] However, it must be true that in Transjordan and in the region of Moab and Edom, certain branches of the Hebrews lived before 1400 B. C..

According to Meek, Joshua led a group of Hebrews into Canaan in the Amarna period; and some of these Hebrews (Ḫabiru), repulsed in Canaan, went to Goshen and later were delivered by Moses. Yahweh, the god of Judah, did not become the national god until David.[2] Judah itself, Albright says, probably came with Moses and entered the country from the north, since it was one of the Leah tribes. The close connection of the Leah tribes with Moses is supported by a number of traditions, and especially by the fact that the first conquered territory, the land of Sihon, became the heritage of Reuben, the eldest son of Lea. Moses himself, as a Levite, belonged to a Leah tribe.[3] His tribe amalgamated with the Judahite, Simeonites, Kenites, and Calebites and formed a southern confederacy with its own code of laws accepted at Kadesh. Later they pushed northward into what was later Judaean territory.[4]

---

[1] JAOS, LIV, 1934, pp. 169-177. Cf. Abel, RB, VII, p. 554; VIII, pp. 438 ff; XL, pp. 214 ff; Albright, JPOS, XII, p. 258.

[2] "A Proposed Reconstruction of Early Hebrew History" AJT, XXIV, 1920, pp. 209-216.

[3] BASOR, No. 58, 1935, p. 17, n. 21. Concerning the problem of Judah's Settlement, see Noth; Palästinajahrbuch, 1934, pp. 31 ff.

[4] Meek, Hebrew Origins, pp. 31 f.

CONCLUSION

The word Ḫabiru appears in cuneiform literature from Babylonia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Asia Minor and Palestine from the second millennium down to the thirteenth century B. C.. The word is usually written phonetically ḫa-bi-ru, but interchanging with this at times is the ideogram SA·GAZ. However, it does not necessarily follow that SA.GAZ in every instance is to be interpreted as ḫa-bi-ru, because the only definitely attested equivalent of the ideogram is ḫabbatu, "plunderer, brigand, nomad".

In the Egyptian inscriptions, the word Ḫabiru appears as ʿEperu or Shashu. It is difficult to say what tribe the ʿEperu was, because what Hebrew group did go to Egypt and what Hebrew group did stay in Egypt is difficult to know.

The word Ḫabiru (ʿEperu or ʿApiru also) is never a gentilic, but an appellative. However, in two Babylonian documents, Ḫa-bi-raʾ-a appears as a gentilic. Wherever we meet them, the Ḫabiru are aliens, men without a country, and adventurers. In Babylonia and in southern Asia Minor, they were mercenaries, as they were among the Hittites and the Hurrians. In Mesopotamia, they were "war prisoners", "foreigners","wanderers" and "Nomads". In Egypt they were called "Shashu" (bedouin)in the Karnak texts, because of their racial characteristics. They also appear as ʿEperu doing the heavy labour along with mercenaries and other hirelings.

The Ḫabiru is phonetically equivalent with the Hebrew (Ibrim) of the Old Testament. As T. J. Meek suggests, the name Ḫabiru began as an appellative, with no ethnic connotation whatsoever, but it ended as a gentilic, and then specifically as the ethnic name of a group of people whom we now know as the Hebrews.[1] As Rabbi Parzen concludes, the name Hebrew (Ibri) is a mark of inferiority denoting an alien, a barbarian, a Bedouin ..... a mock-name that ridiculed its bearers.[2]

The first migration of the Hebrews into Palestine seems to be contemporaneous with a part of the Hurrian migration to the west about the second millennium to the eighteenth century B. C..

The migration took place with the Hyksos movement as an Aramaean migration in successive waves over a considerable period of time. Among them only a comparatively small group ever went to Egypt, and others remained in Palestine (Cf. I Chronicles 1-8), some of them in northern Palestine and the others in southeastern part of Palestine (Cf. Judges 11:26). The account of the settlement of the Ḫabiru in Palestine seems to parallel the Old Testament account of Israel's settlement in Canaan, especially are the accounts of the Ḫabiru conquest of Jericho parallel with the account of the Israelites under Joshua.

---

[1] Hebrew Origins, 1936, p. 13.

[2] AJSL, XLIX, 1932, p. 258.

But it is hard to classify the Ḫabiru group of people mentioned by Abdi-Ḫiba of Jerusalem in his letters, because they were not an ethnic unit, but a composite group, perhaps Aramaean.

I have tried to show their characteristic early history in the foreign lands before the twelfth century B. C.. Later discoveries will, I hope, give us more materials and afford a basis for more conclusions of the Ḫabiru problem.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albright, W. F. "Revision of Early Hebrew Chronology". JPOS, I (1923), 49-79.

Albright, W. F. "Historical and Mythical Elements in the Story of Joseph". JBL, XXXVII (1918), 8-143.

Albright, W. F. "Contributions to Biblical Archaeology and Philology". JBL, XLIII (1924), 363-393.

Albright, W. F. "Archaeology and the Date of the Hebrew Conquest". BASOR, No. 58 (1935), 10-18.

Albright, W. F. The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible. Third Edition. New York, London and Edinburgh: Revell, 1935.

Alt, A. "Hebräer". Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Vol. II. 1928.

Alt, A. Der Gott der Väter. "Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der israelitischen Religion", Stuttgart, 1929.

Barton, G. A. Archaeology and the Bible. Seventh Edition. Revised. 1937, American S. S. Union, Philadelphia.

Barton, G. A. "The Habiru of the El-Amarna Tablets and the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine". JBL, XLVIII (1929), 144-148.

Bergman, A. "The Israelite Occupation of Eastern Palestine in the Light of Territorial History". JAOS, LIV (1934), 169-177.

Böhl, F. Kanaanäer und Hebräer. Leipzig, 1911.

Böhl, F. "Das Zeitalter Abrahams". Der Alte Orient, B. 29, Heft, 1, Leipzig, 1931.

Burney, C. F. Israel's Settlement in Canaan", The Biblical Tradition and its Historical Background", The Schweich Lecture, London, 1917.

Burney, C. F. The Book of Judges: With Introduction and Notes. Second Edition. London, 1930.

Chiera, E. and Speiser, E. A. "A New Factor in the History of the Ancient East". AASOR, VI (1926), 84 f.

Chiera, E. and Speiser, E. A. "Selected 'KIRKUK' Documents". JAOS, XLVII (1927), 36-60.

Clay, Albert T. The Empire of the Amorites. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1919.

Dhorme, P. "Les Ḫabiru et Les Hebreux". JPOS, IV (1924) 162 f.

Dhorme, R. P. P. "Les Nouvelles Tablettes d'El-Amarna". RB, XXXIII (1924), 5-32.

Eerdmans, B. D. Alttestamentliche Studien, Vol. II: Die Vorgeschichte Israels. Gietzen, 1908.

Forrer, E. O. "The Hittites in Palestine". I. QSt, 1936, pp. 190-203.

Forrer, E. O. "The Hittites in Palestine". II. QSt, 1937, pp. 100-115.

Gordon, H. "Evidence for the Horite Language from Nuzi". BASOR, No. 64 (1936) pp. 23 f.

Gressmann, H, (ed.). Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testamente, Vol. I. Tübingen, 1909.

Gressmann, H. Mose und seine Zeit: Ein Kommentar zu den Mose-Sagen, Göttingen, 1913.

Grice, E. M. Records from Ur and Larsa Dated in the Larsa Dynasty. Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts, Vol. V, 1919.

Gustavs, A. "Abd-ḫiba Puti-i-Ḫepa". OLZ, 1911, pp. 341-343.

Gustavs, A. "Der Gott Ḫabiru". ZATW, XL (1922), 313-314.

Gustavs, A. "Die Personennamen in den Tontafelnvon Tell Taʿannek". ZOPV, L (1927), 1-18.

Gustavs, A. "Was heisst ilâni Ḫabiru?" ZATW, XLIV (1926), 25-38.

Hommel, F. The Ancient Hebrew Tradition as illustrated by the Monuments. 1897.

Hommel, F. "The True Date of Abraham and Moses". ET, X (1899), 210 f.

Jack, J. W. The Date of the Exodus: in the Light of External Evidence. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1925.

Jastrow, M. "Egypt and Palestine, 1400 B. C." JBL, VI (1892), 45-124.

Jirku, A. "Die ägyptischen Listen palästinensischer und syrischer Orstnamen". KLIO, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte, Leipzig, 1937.

Jirku, A. "Die Wanderungen der Hebräer im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. ch." Der Alte Orient, B. 24, Heft, 2, Leipzig, 1924.

Jirku, A. "Götter Ḫabiru oder Götter der Ḫabiru?" ZATW, XLIV (1926), 237-242.

Jirku, A. "Aufsticg und Untergang der Hyksos". JPOS, XII (1932), 51 f.

Kittel, R. Geschichte des Volkes Israel, B. I. Stuttgart, 1932.

Knudtzon, J. A. Die El-Amarna-Tafeln, B. I. and II. Leipzig, 1915.

Konig, E. und Jirku, A. "Zur Chabiru-Frage". ZATW, XLVI (1928), 199-212.

Langdon, S. "Babylon and 'The Land Beyond the River'." ET, XXX (1918), 46-463.

Langdon, S. H. "The Ḫabiri and the Hebrews: New Material in the Problem". ET, XXXI (1920), 324 f.

Lewy, J. "Habiru und Hebräer". OLZ, XXX (1927) 738-746; 825-833.

Luckenbill, D. D. "The Wandering Arameans". AJSL, XXXVI (1920), 244 f.

Lutz, H. F. Early Babylonian Letters from Larsa. Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts, Vol. II, 1917.

Meek, Th. J. "A Proposed Reconstruction of Early Hebrew History". AJTh, XXIV (1920), 211 f.

Meek, Th. J. Hebrew Origins. New York and London: Harper, 1936.

Meek, Th. J. "The Israelite Conquest of Ephraim". BASOR, No. 61 (1936), pp. 17-19.

Meek, Th. J. "Some Gleanings from the Last Excavations at Nuzi Annual of the ASOR." Vol. XIII (1933), pp. 1 f.

Meek, Th. J. "Some Religious Origins of the Hebrews". AJSL, XXXVII (1921), 101 f.

Olmstead, A. T. History of Palestine and Syria. New York and London, 1931.

Parzon, Herbert. "The Problem of the IBRIM (Hebrews) in the Bible". AJSL, XLIX (1933), 254-261.

Paton, L. B. The Early History of Syria and Palestine. New York: Scribner's, 1901.

Paton, L. B. "Israel's Conquest of Canaan". JBL, XXXII (1913) 1-53

Pederson, J. P. E. Israel, its Life and Culture. Vols. I-II, London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1926.

Reche, O. "Hebräer". Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte, Max Ebert (ed.), Berlin, 1926.

Robinson and Oesterley. A History of Israel, Vol. I. Oxford, 1934.

Robinson, T. H. "The Date of the Exodus". ET, XLVII (1935), 53 f.

Roger, R. W. Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament. London, 1912.

Rowe, A. The Topography and History of Beth-Shan. Philadelphia, 1930.

Sayce, A. H. "Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology". ET, XV (1903), 282 f.

Schrader, E. Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testamente, Dritte Auflage von H. Zimmern und H. Winckler. Berlin, 1903.

Smith, J. M. P. "Southern Influences upon Hebrew Prophecy". AJSL, XXXV (1918), 1-19.

Speiser, E. A. "A Letter of Saushshatar and the date of the Kirkuk Tablets". JAOS, XLIX (1929), 269 f.

Speiser, E. A. "Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B. C.: "The Hurrians and their connections with the Habiru and the Hyksos". AASOR, XIII (1933), 29 f.

Speiser, E. A. Mesopotamian Origins: The Basic Population of the Near East. Philadelphia and London, 1930.

Speiser, E. A. "One Hundred New Selected NUZI Texts". Transliterated by Robert H. Pfeiffer. AASOR, XV (1935), 1 ff.

Steurnagel, C. Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan, 1901.

Wardle, W. L. Israel and Babylon. London, 1925.

Weber in Knudtzon's. Die El-Amarna-Tafeln, Vol. II. Anmerkungen und Register: bearbeitet von O. Weber und E. Ebeling, (1907-1915).

Weinheimer, H. "Hebräer und Israeliten". ZATW, XXIX (1909), 275-280.

Wilson, J. A. "The ʿEPERU of the Egyptian Inscription". AJSL, XLIX (1933), 275-280.

Winckler, H. Altorientalische Forschungen, Vol. III. Leipzig, 1902.

Winckler, H. Geschichte Israels in Einzeldarstellungen, B. Vol. I Leipzig, 1895.

GTU Library
3 2400 00686 1284

LIBRARY USE ONLY